THEOLOGY

VOL. XXXIX SEPTEMBER, 1939 No. 231

EDITORIAL

WE can repeat to-day the remark made by Matthew Arnold in the preface to *God and the Bible* with no less conviction though with different implications. " At the present moment," he said, " two things about the Christian religion must surely be clear to anybody with eyes in his head. One is, that men cannot do without it; the other, that they cannot do with it as it is." The attempts that have since then been made to modify or reinterpret the Christian religion and so to adapt it to modern needs have produced such meagre results that it is common nowadays to belittle the motives, as well as the intelligence, of those who made the attempts. Arnold himself was not the least distinguished of those who tried to meet a need which he saw to be both urgent and far-reaching. But to-day we find it as hard to be indulgent to the shortcomings of those who tried to meet the need as to understand the complacency and ostrich-like assurance of those who denied that any need existed. We suppose that neither the " liberal " nor the " orthodox " theologians of the nineteenth century have much to teach us now, and that we must look for theological guidance either from our contemporaries or much further back. For our part, we have no wish to reinstate the more popular and influential of the Victorian theologians on the pedestals from which they have fallen. That for the present their work should be unduly depreciated is natural, and scarcely to be regretted; we are, however, glad to see that fuller justice is at last being done to a few great theologians of the period who were by no means popular or influential at the time, who had few disciples, and who founded no lasting " school of thought," but who have much more to teach us to-day than those who did. In England we should say that this is true both of F. D. Maurice and of J. H. Newman, and in Germany of J. A. Moehler, which is the case we have particularly in mind.

* * * * *

They all had to plough a lonely furrow, though Moehler less than the others because he was the leader of a small group of like-minded theologians and also perhaps because he died while still a young man. All were suspected of error, if not of heresy, and fell for longer or shorter periods into ecclesiastical disrepute. Yet, while acutely sensitive to the spirit of the age and in many ways affected by it, and keenly aware of the need for theological renewal, each had too firm a hold of the essence of the Christian faith to succumb to the facile tendency to subordinate it to the philosophies that were in fashion. Matthew Arnold, on the other hand, held that " the first Christians misunderstood Jesus "—inevitably, because they did not enjoy the advantages of modern enlightenment. We have less confidence to-day in the superiority of " modern thought," and we have a shrewd suspicion that the first Christians understood Jesus better than most Christians in the nineteenth century. Mr Richardson's article illustrates the changes that have taken place in the understanding of the Bible. Theology to-day is emphatically biblical, though not at all in the sense of regarding the Bible as a collection of proof-texts. Theology to-day is also emphatically ecclesiastical or —as we had better say in view of the associations of that word—churchly. If we were rewriting Arnold's epigram, we should say: " Two things about the Christian *Church* must surely be clear to anybody with eyes in his head. One is, that men cannot do without it; the other, that they cannot do with it as it is." " Religion " is neither a specifically biblical word nor a specifically Christian word; " Church " (*Ecclesia*) is both.[1] The doctrine of the Church is seen to-day to be of central importance, not only because collectivism is everywhere superseding individualism, but because biblical theology is showing that the Church, the new Israel, the mystical body of Christ, is a primary Christian fact and an essential Christian category. It is an integral part of the fact of Christ to which faith is the Christian's surrender and response.

* * * * *

It is significant that, although the doctrine of the Church figured largely in the teaching of the Tractarians, it is not to them, but to Maurice, that Anglicans are turning to-day for a deeper understanding of this article of their faith.

[1] Cp. *Doctrine in the Church of England*, pp. 100 *ff.*

Likewise, in the Roman Catholic Church there are signs of a fresh and lively interest in the work of Moehler, which was chiefly devoted to a renewal of the doctrine of the Church in the light of Scripture and the early Fathers. We have received a valuable collection of essays, entitled *L'Eglise est Une : Hommage à Moehler*,[1] to which fourteen French and German theologians have contributed, and which has been published in German as well as in French. It is valuable, not only because it supplies a comprehensive exposition of the teaching of a theologian who has been sadly neglected in his own communion and who, partly for that reason no doubt, has not received the ecumenical recognition which he deserves, but also because it contains essays which, while not directly concerned with Moehler, bear the authentic impress of his spirit. Two of these stand out in particular: *Le mystère de l'Eglise : du Scandale à la Foi triomphante*, by Professor Karl Adam of Tübingen; and *Les voies de l'Unité*, by Father Pribilla, S.J., of Munich. If the whole volume is not to be translated into English, we hope that at least these two essays will be.

* * * * *

This renewed apprehension of the Church as the body of Christ is disconcerting, to say the least. For it is the apprehension that the *Corpus Christi* or the *Una Sancta* is not merely a beautiful idea or ideal, but a brute fact. "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered." The transcendent kingdom of God, which is beyond history, is really present in the historic Church. Church realism is the corollary of biblical realism. Christ is here and now in the Church speaking and acting in judgment and in mercy. But at the moment when this is apprehended, the existing condition of the Church or of the Churches becomes a scandal in a way that it never was before. The disunity, the worldliness, the compromises, the lack of imagination and holiness and apostolic zeal, which characterize the Churches as we know them, are seen to belie faith's insight into the real being of the Church. The believer is tempted at first to evade the contradiction by the way of ecclesiastical perfectionism, which is the counterpart of secular utopianism. Admittedly, he exclaims, the Church is far from being what

[1] Edited by Pierre Chaillet. Bloud et Gay, Paris (75 frs.).

it ought to be; but we must reform it, revolutionize it, if necessary, then it will be clearly recognized as a glorious and triumphant body, and it will no longer be a scandal and an offence. But the notion that we can constitute a perfect Church is as much of an illusion as the notion that we can achieve a secular Utopia.

* * * * *

Professor Adam grasps the nettle firmly. The Church always has been and always will be a scandal. The Incarnate Lord was a scandal. The Word of God was made man. That is the mystery of His Person. " L'éternel apparaît éphémère, temporel; l'infini, fini, limité; le parfait, fragile et fragmentaire; le saint, dans ' un corps de péché.' " " They were offended in Him." And no wonder ! There was the scandal of particularity, of suffering, of rejection, of death. What was true of the Incarnate Lord is true also of Christ in the Church. All that was present there to cause offence is present here too, and much more because of the presence of sin. The Christ in the Church is the humiliated Christ, the Christ rejected and crucified, the Christ who triumphs through weakness and suffering. " Tant que nous vivons *in statu viæ*, la théologie chrétienne véritable devra toujours être et demeurer une *theologia crucis*. Quand on essaie d'atténuer la tension eschatologique dans le Christ, et son retentissement nécessaire pour la forme de l'Eglise, on méconnaît le sens fondamental du message de Jésus. . . . Le christianisme n'est pas la plénitude achevée, mais seulement la voie qui y mène. Le christianisme n'est pas le terme, mais seulement la dernière étape; c'est un intérim plein de tension et de lutte, d'obscurité et de risque, mais aussi de foi certaine et de joyeuse espérance."

* * * * *

Thus it will be the case till the end of time that men cannot do without the Church and that they cannot do with it as it is. To suppose that the Church can be so altered or reformed as to be emptied of scandal is to misconceive the mystery of its nature. This is not, of course, to say that Christians must adopt a fatalistic attitude to abuses in the Church, or that there is no obligation upon us to work for ecclesiastical reform, and even on occasion for revolution. But it means that in doing so we must beware of self-deception; above all, we must beware of

the proud pretension that it is within our power to remove all causes of offence. "The disciple is not above His master." There is no excuse, however, for fatalism or for lethargy. "It must needs be that offences come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh!" The contradiction in the Church will not be resolved until the final consummation of the kingdom of God. We "show forth the Lord's death, till He come." And in an hour when offences seem more likely to increase than to be removed, we shall do well to recall the words of Newman, which Father Pribilla quotes: "To expect great effects from our exertions for religious objects is natural indeed, and innocent, but it arises from inexperience of the kind of work we have to do—to change the heart and will of man. It is a far nobler frame of mind, to labour, not with the hope of seeing the fruit of our labour, but for conscience' sake, as a matter of duty; and again, in faith trusting good *will* be done, though we see it not. Look through the Bible, and you will find God's servants, even though they began with success, end with disappointment; not that God's purposes or His instruments fail, but that the time for reaping what we have sown is hereafter, not here; that here there is no great visible fruit in any one man's life time."[1]

[1] Newman, *Plain and Parochial Sermons*, viii, pp. 129 *f.*

The Nature of the Biblical Theology

During the course of Christian thought several different conceptions of the nature of theology have appeared. This article is an attempt to define what is the *biblical* conception of the nature of theology, and it is based upon the conviction that this biblical view is the true view. We shall begin by considering three views of the nature of theology which have been prominent during the last century of theological discussion, but which we believe to be at variance with the biblical standpoint.

Theology considered as an Empirical Science

The development of modern science since the Renaissance has been characterized by the way in which each of the separate sciences in its turn has claimed for itself complete autonomy or freedom to interpret its subject in terms of its own categories, and not in those of some other science or of philosophy. It is not surprising that sooner or later theology itself should have joined in the revolt and claimed to be autonomous. Schleiermacher was the great champion of theological autonomy. Theology must stand on its own feet and claim independence of both metaphysics and history. According to Schleiermacher's view, the starting-point of theology is the religious experience of the individual soul, not rationalistic theorizing or even historical revelation. Thus theology is essentially subjectivist, a description of religious experience. Doctrine is not based upon something which is objectively given or revealed, but is a description of our own religious experiences. Dogmatic is the systematization of the convictions of our own Church in our own time.

Schleiermacher's lead has been followed by many theologians since his own day. Theology has been regarded by this school of thought as a natural or empirical science whose object is " the interrogation of the religious consciousness with a view to discovering what religion really is."[1] A whole school of " empirical theology " has grown up—especially in America—which begins, not with history, or revelation, or rationalistic speculation, but with the facts of religious experience. Professor W. M. Horton, after

[1] J. Baillie, *The Interpretation of Religion*, p. 14.

mentioning such thinkers as Hocking, Lyman, Wieman, and D. C. Macintosh, goes on to say: " Common to all these thinkers is the tendency to regard God, provisionally at least, not as a Being behind and apart from the world of experience, but rather as a Being revealed *in* human experience, a Dependable Factor in it which can be isolated by scientific analysis just as one isolates chemical elements, or bacteria or vitamines."[1]

In criticism of such a view of the nature of theology, we would object, not that the use of such methods is false or unprofitable, but rather that it constitutes too narrow a view of what theology is. It mistakes the part for the whole. No doubt, if we wish to discover what is the nature of religion in general, we should thus " interrogate the religious consciousness ": that such an inquiry will greatly clarify our understanding of the nature of religious phenomena we do not doubt; that it might even lead to the establishment of a tentative empirical probability concerning the existence of a " Supreme Being " we dare not deny; but that it is the whole, or even the essential, task of *Christian* theology we cannot believe—if only because it leaves entirely out of account precisely that feature of the total situation which the Bible is concerned to assert and which the Church exists to proclaim—namely, the objective revelation of God Himself at certain specific moments in certain historical situations. For anyone who takes the Bible seriously, the " science of theology " in the above empirical sense can never be more than a preparatory discipline, or a flanking movement in apologetics, or an interesting psychological or philosophical inquiry, since it does not and cannot deal with the theology of which the Bible speaks. The biblical writers are entirely uninterested in scientific and psychological problems and in the description of religious experiences for their own sake.

Theology considered as a Branch of Metaphysics

At the same time we must admit the element of truth in the view of Schleiermacher and his more recent followers. A scientific inquiry into the nature of the religious consciousness is logically prior to the framing of a metaphysical system, since religious experience must provide certain important *data* for the metaphysician. In this sense the

[1] *Theism and the Modern Mood*, p. 71.

autonomy of theology must be asserted, or, in clearer language, religion must not be placed under the dictatorship of metaphysics. The view that the basis of theology is to be found in metaphysical theorizing is not compatible with the insights of the Bible. Any metaphysical system which endeavours to force the content of the biblical message into the mould of its own preconceived categories will deny the truth of the biblical idea of revelation and will consequently distort that very element of Christian religious conviction which Christians regard as being of primary religious importance. Ritschl was right in attempting to free theology from its bondage to speculative rationalism of the Hegelian type, but he was wrong in asserting that theology has no connexion whatever with metaphysics. His error lay in over-confidence in what is, after all, a metaphysical theory—namely, his rigid separation of "judgments of fact" from "judgments of value." The truth is that religion always implies something for metaphysics: our religious convictions or experiences must profoundly affect our whole view of the universe, even though those convictions and experiences are perhaps never attained by metaphysical argument.

Theology considered as the Investigation of History

Both types of theology which we have dealt with neglect the factor which the Bible takes most seriously—namely, history. The psychology of religious experience, like mysticism, takes no account of the historical, and metaphysics deals with eternal truths which exist independently of history, or which at most are only expressed in or illustrated by history. Christian theology, on the other hand, stands or falls with the conception of God's revelation of Himself in history. The great merit of Ritschl lay in the fact that, over against subjectivism and speculative idealism, he laid stress upon the importance of history, and of historical revelation as something objectively given. But Ritschl seems to think that the historical facts themselves *are* the revelation, and that anyone whose moral vision is not perverted by false theories or impure motives will be able to recognize them as such. The revelation is thus given to us in the stuff of "profane" history and is therefore open to direct historical investigation. Hence the task

of theology is to lay bare the historical facts, what Jesus did and what He said, and so on, laying aside all the theological preconceptions (*Gemeindetheologie*) with which they have been overlaid: the quest of the historical Jesus had now set out upon its winding road from Reimarus to Wrede and Schweitzer. A scientific understanding of history is the goal of theological inquiry, if the divine is immanent in history. But the defect of this view (sometimes known as "historicism") is that it cannot account for the failure of many wise and good men to make the right "value-judgment" concerning the Person of Jesus Christ. It cannot explain why it is impossible to demonstrate to a good Hindu the superiority of the Christian religion. It cannot tell us why what was obvious to Peter or Zacchæus or Paul was not equally apparent to John the Baptist or Pilate or Gamaliel. It cannot explain the mystery of the "divine election"—or what is called in some circles to-day the "incognito" of Jesus. The historical facts cannot themselves *be* the revelation, or the teaching of history would be the essence of evangelization.

In the reaction from historicism which has taken place in recent theology, there has been a tendency to go too far in the opposite direction, and almost to deny the significance of the historical altogether. The Gospels, it is insisted, are not the work of historians and biographers, but of preachers and missionaries: their subject is religion, not history, belief, not fact. It is a curious thing that the extreme liberalism which found in "the truth of idea" the essence of Christian teaching stood upon the same ground as the extreme "Barthian" view that what is important is the revelation itself, not the historical facts through which it was made: this common ground is an extreme scepticism concerning the recoverability of the historical element in the Gospel-story. But the course of Church history has shown that, if we lose touch with history, we soon fall a prey to forms of Docetism, Gnosticism or Subjectivism. Every preacher knows that it is the *facts* of the Gospel-story which are the most effectual instruments of conversion: that is why the Gospel writers develop so fully the story of how Jesus died. The story, told without sentiment or adornment, is the most powerful of all evangelistic influences; this is the element of truth which underlies historicism.

The Idea of Revelation in these Types of Theology

Let us turn for a moment to consider the attitude of each of the above three types of view concerning the nature of theology towards the idea of revelation.

(1) The problem, as it presents itself to those who regard theology as " the interrogation of the religious consciousness," is that of working out a gentleman's agreement between " discovery " and " revelation." In the extreme form of this theory all theology is " natural theology," and hence there can be no room for the idea of the revelation of a truth by God which was in itself inaccessible to the mind of man. Generally speaking, this type of theory presents discovery as the reverse side of revelation: the Gospel is only the " republication " of the truths of natural religion. Discovery and revelation are complementary aspects of the same fact of religious experience. The incarnation of God in Christ is not unique, but supreme. If all truth is both discovered and revealed, and if reason and revelation are not contrasted but correlative terms, then we are left with a secularized conception of religious truth which is unable to explain to us what it is which differentiates biblical religion from all other forms of religion and from all merely " natural theology." Somehow the free grace of God's revelation in Jesus Christ has been made to appear less gracious and miraculous than the Bible perceives it to be.

(2) Theories which subordinate theology to metaphysics, such as speculative rationalism, have no place for the biblical idea of revelation. Even if the Absolute is said to reveal its nature by the dialectical necessity of logic or of history, the biblical idea of revelation through certain specific historical situations remains repugnant to it. There is, of course, another kind of rationalism, the medieval-scholastic, which claims that reason may share with revelation the whole field of what may be called " religious knowledge," and which is by no means incompatible with the biblical view of revelation. Indeed, for fifteen hundred years natural religion and revelation were deemed to be complementary, though in a quite different sense from that of the " empirical theology " considered above. Some such view of natural religion is held by the biblical writers themselves, especially St Paul, who argues that there is

a rudimentary " natural " knowledge of God even among the Gentiles to whom the revelation has not been vouchsafed. The difference from the religious point of view between, say, Aquinas and Hegel, both representatives of rationalism in theology, is not that Aquinas was less confident in his belief in reason than was Hegel, but that he did not allow rationalistic speculation to override the content of the biblical revelation, which he accepted loyally as possessing not less authority and value than the dictates of reason itself. For those who take the biblical idea of revelation seriously this difference is a very important one.

(3) Historicism is right in looking for an authoritative revelation in history, but it is wrong in so far as it tends to identify revelation with the actual events of history. The biblical view does not countenance the idea of God as being a " process " immanent within history, but always presents Him as a Being who transcends history, yet manifests His purpose in it. For that reason any reaction from historicism to a position which separates revelation from the historical events by which it is conveyed is equally unsatisfactory. We must neither confuse revelation with history nor separate it from history. Professor Quick has called attention to the ambiguity of the word " revelation," which may mean either *revelatio*, the act of revealing, or *revelatum*, the thing revealed. He rightly points out that this ambiguity conceals a fatal confusion in what is usually considered to be the " Barthian " view of the subject—namely, the assumption that " because in revelation the revealing act is God's, not man's, therefore the reality revealed cannot become the object of human thought, or be acknowledged as true by the rational or philosophic judgment of the human mind. The reply to this argument must simply be, *Non sequitur*."[1] The *revelatum* must be capable of rational and philosophical criticism just as it must be capable of expression (however imperfectly) by human beings in human language.

The Biblical Doctrine of Revelation

But what is the nature of the *revelatum*? According to biblical theology, it is certainly not a series of truths in propositional form, such as that " God is love " or that " Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners." Ad-

[1] *The Ground of Faith and the Chaos of Thought*, pp. 116*f.*, footnote.

mittedly, the *revelatum* must be expressed by us in propositional forms of this kind, but it is not itself *given* to us in a series of propositions. It is not a system of doctrine or a metaphysic. Nor is it an historical event, or a series of historical events. Nor, again, is it an ineffable mystical experience. Let us attempt a tentative definition of what the *revelatum* is in the biblical conception. It is an historical event, or series of events, apprehended by faith as having a certain definite significance. In this definition the words "apprehended by faith" are of crucial importance, because where faith is lacking, even when a large measure of intellectual understanding of the historical event and its alleged significance is present, revelation has not occurred, or, in other words, no *revelatum* has been received. The deficiency of the other three conceptions of the nature of theology which we have previously considered is now seen to be that each of them omits that which is crucial for the biblical view—namely, faith. Faith is something which God gives, not something which man creates through any "will to believe" on his part. *Revelatum* is inseparable from *revelatio*, since no one can receive the former save through God's activity in the latter. Doubtless man is free to accept or to refuse the divine gift, but he is not able to create for himself that which the New Testament calls faith. Faith is that which God evokes in response to His *revelatio*; it is not the passing of a value-judgment or the perception of a truth which is eternally true, or any other human activity. Without faith the "incognito" of Christ cannot be penetrated; He cannot be acknowledged as Lord, and the finality of the Christian revelation cannot be known.

This does not mean that faith is, in its essence, irrational or opposed to reason. It is not something which we are expected to receive without criticism, without the operation of our rational faculty. Nor does it mean that Christian faith is different in kind from other varieties of faith. There is descriptively no difference between a man's faith in Christ and his faith in his friend or his doctor. The psychological processes are at work in each case, and we do not need to attribute anything peculiarly mysterious or numinous to Christian faith. Faith is not a kind of wonderful "faculty" which Christians have and others have not. It is the response of the whole personality to the fact of Christ, and as such it is not of our making, but

owes its existence to Christ. In just the same way, if I have faith in my friend, it is my friend who has aroused this faith in me; it corresponds, as it were, to something objective in him. Had I invented or imagined it, it would be credulity, not faith, not something upon which I could depend. It has been given to me. In the same way faith in Christ is evoked by Christ, or is given to us by Christ. Christian faith is different from other kinds of faith in virtue of the quality of its object, or in virtue of the nature of that which evokes it; it is nothing which is irrational or inexplicable in terms of our everyday experience of life. Yet it is none the less the gift of God.

Reason, also, must have its own place of honour in our biblical theology. The very fact that biblical theology is a theology of the Word implies that reason has an important part in Christian thought, because words are a function of rational beings and are meaningless apart from reason. The function of reason in theology is not the *discovery* of truth as such, but the formulation and criticism of its expressions. We may say that reason has a threefold task in theology. First, it must examine the content of the *revelatum*, criticize the expression of it and accept it on rational grounds; this is the task of *exegesis*, or of biblical and historical criticism. Secondly, it must formulate it into a body of truth which is coherent with all other known truth; this is the task of *dogmatic* or of systematic theology. Thirdly, it must defend the insights of religion against all the attacks, prejudices and superstitions which are based upon a non-Christian view of the world; this is the task of *apologetic*, the marshalling of the evidence in favour of the Christian view of life and of the universe.

The uniqueness of Christianity consists not in any propositional statements which it can make about the nature of God, but in the historical " once-ness " of Christ's revelation of God " under Pontius Pilate." If we were to discover to-morrow a South Sea island of which the inhabitants had reached a belief in God as holy and loving, and who tried to live in a manner pleasing to such a God, but who had never heard of Jesus of Nazareth, we should have come no stage nearer to disproving the uniqueness of Christianity, since the latter is not simply the affirmation of such a belief. It asserts rather that such a God has actually revealed Himself at a specific moment in history; that He repeatedly reveals Himself to believers in every age through the gift

of faith, that He makes known His will in the affairs of men, and that He offers to them salvation and a life of fellowship with Him. Between these two conceptions there is all the difference which exists between subjective and objective, between wish and fulfilment, between imagination and perception. Christianity knows of a God who has not left Himself without witness, who does not leave men to rely upon the interrogation of their own poor religious consciousness for the establishment of their knowledge of Him.

The Eschatological Emphasis of Biblical Theology

The Bible maintains that the knowledge of God is grounded upon or mediated through God's own deliberate acts in history. Thus, when we say that Christianity is an historical religion, we do not merely mean that Jesus was a definite historical figure (unlike, say, Isis)—for so also were Confucius and Plato and Moses. Nor do we mean that Jesus changed the course of history, or as we say, " made history," for so also did the lives of many other great men. It means rather that in the events of the life, ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus, as they have come down to us in the Gospel-story, God has addressed a Word to the world, a Word which is apprehended only by faith—by the faith which the Gospel-story itself evokes. The Gospels thus claim not merely to be recording a major historical event, important for all future history, but to be dealing with that which enters history from beyond history, the secret which gives meaning or purpose to all history. To the eye of the secular historian the events which the Gospels record are indeed historical events, like any other events in the time series, and as such the historian must criticize and evaluate them. But it is not the task of the historian to estimate their religious significance; this task is entirely outside his competence *qua* historian. To the eye of faith they are not only historical events, they are *eschatological* events; that is to say, their significance enters history from beyond history and reveals the purpose of God which lies behind history. The historian may criticize the historicity of the Gospel-story, *qua* history, and it is his function and duty to do so; but he cannot criticize the Gospel message itself, for that is the message which God Himself speaks to us through the story, and which

" criticizes " (or judges) us, and which we accept through His gift of faith. The *revelatum* itself is not open to criticism —man cannot judge the Word of God—yet any theological formulations that we can give to it most certainly are to be criticized by us. The Gospel writers do not record history for its own sake, but for the sake of the eschatological message which is given through history.

Contemporary New Testament scholarship is accordingly ceasing to look upon Gospel research as a mere attempt to lay bare the original historical facts. Professor C. H. Dodd has recently pointed out that there are no such things as " bare facts," and that it is impossible to separate " facts " from their meanings.[1] The writing of history involves the interpretation of the meaning of facts, not the mere recording of " bare facts," supposing that such were possible. Thus, we no longer believe that it is possible in New Testament criticism to separate the historical facts from the meaning which the Gospel writers saw in them, without distorting the record of the historical facts themselves. That is to say, we no longer regard the theological meaning attached to the historical facts as being mere " first-century accretions " or *Gemeindetheologie*, which is irrelevant to our own interpretation of the Gospel-story. We cannot believe that the historical facts, as such, are the content of the revelation, which is thus open to direct inspection by us, and we would put forward the view that the *revelatum* is not a matter of " bare fact " but is the whole complex of historical events together with the interpretation which the apostolic witness attached to them and which is apprehended on our part by living, personal faith. The faith, we might say, is thus not given entirely in history, but in history and preaching: the events of history interpreted in the light of a Gospel of salvation.

There is to-day a widespread movement of return towards a biblical theology. The late Professor H. R. Macintosh has said that Schleiermacher inaugurated the discussions of " the greatest century in theology since the fourth." However that may be, we cannot help but regard the characteristically new positions which were reached in theology as, on the whole, an aberration from the true course of a biblical theology. That is not to say that the whole investigation of new theological courses has been a waste of time. The

[1] *History and the Gospel*, chapter i.

wide country of Christian affirmation and experience has been thoroughly explored and charted; several avenues which had at first seemed to be attractive have been shown to be dead ends, and, in general, it may perhaps be said that it has been learned that Christianity has little to gain by compromising its Gospel in overtures to humanistic thought. The adventures of the prodigal son in the far country, uncomfortable though they may have proved at the time, nevertheless left their subject a wiser man than his stay-at-home brother; and it is improbable that the prodigal who had at last learned to appreciate the security of his father's house ever found cause to regret that he had once on a day set off for a far country. Without a sympathetic understanding of the motives and ambitions of Schleiermacher, Ritschl and the rest, the theological insights which have in our own day prompted a return to a biblical theology will remain unintelligible to us.

ALAN RICHARDSON.

The Atonement and the Life of Human Society[1]

I

I AM to speak on the subject of "The Atonement and the Life of Human Society." It is impossible for me to know in advance what the words "the Atonement" will mean to the conference by the time that I come to speak. I must therefore begin with some few words about what the Atonement will be taken to mean in the rest of this paper, and trust that the earlier discussions, though they are bound to reveal the partial nature of this presentation, will not have shown it to be positively erroneous.

The Christian doctrine of the Atonement proclaims God's solution of the problem of evil, a solution wrought in "deeds, not words," through the "Word made flesh." No one knows how evil got into the world; from as far back as we can trace human history we find man wrestling with it in its various forms of ignorance, ugliness, suffering and sin. Of these the last is the most serious, and that for two

[1] A paper read at the fifth of a series of conferences of English and Scandinavian theologians, held at Durham in July, 1939.

reasons. Ignorance, ugliness, and suffering are things which happen to a man, while sin is a corruption of his own inmost self; it is conceivable that by progress in knowledge, culture, and skill the human race might free itself from ignorance, ugliness, and suffering; but man can do nothing with sin except confess that he is a sinner and ask to be cleansed.

The problem of evil may be stated thus: when we contemplate the evil in the world, how can we believe that the world is the creation of an all-good, all-loving, and omnipotent God, and that He is the supreme governor of all that is and happens? How can we avoid saying with Omar Khayyam:

> "Thou who didst man of baser metal make,
> And who with Eden didst devise the snake,
> For all the sin wherewith the face of man
> Is blackened, man's forgiveness give—and take"?

The Christian doctrine of the Atonement asserts that at a definite moment in history God has taken up the challenge expressed in these lines.

I cannot draw a breath or lift up a finger except by using the power of God entrusted to me in my creation. If, therefore, I misuse it to do evil, God is the author of my sins unless He dissociates Himself from my sinful acts. And every act I do, not only derives from God as the source of my being, it also is done to Him; it is the response of the creature to his creator. Now in ordinary human intercourse, when one man sins against another, his victim may morally be either worsened or bettered. It depends on the way in which the injury is taken. If I injure you, and as a result you are embittered and resentful and determined to revenge yourself, then I may have set in motion a chain of evil doings of which the end cannot be seen. But on the other hand you may take the injury in such a way as to absorb its capacity for producing evil by meeting it with forgiving love and making it the occasion for increasing the world's output of goodness.

I stand to God in this double relationship; He is the author of my being and the object of my activity. If, then, in spite of my sins, I am to believe in His goodness, I must believe both that He dissociates Himself from my evil acts and that He takes them in such a way as to absorb their capacity for producing evil. It is important to note that

the first of these requirements is as vital to my faith as the second. Unless I am assured that God does not connive at my sins, but maintains His goodness by disowning them, I cannot retain my faith in Him or hope that, if ever I see the error of my ways and repent, He will be there in His goodness for me to return to. Faith in God demands assurance both that as source of my being He shall exercise wrath against sin and that as object of my activity He shall absorb its capacity for producing evil.

Christianity meets the longing for this twofold assurance by proclaiming that in the actual history of this very world in which we sin and suffer evil, God Himself has undertaken its rescue and redemption in a series of historical acts. So far from conniving at our sins, He has chosen as His way of redemption the living of a human life in which He could Himself become here on earth the injured victim of sinful men, and in that human life He has met those injuries with love unconquered and unconquerable, dying on the cross with the words, " Father, forgive them," upon His lips. It would add nothing to the qualitative perfection of that life and death if they were to be repeated once, twice, or a thousand times. Once for all in the history of this world He has met and overcome the forces of evil. In accepting the painful way of the cross as the way of redemption, He declared, by making Himself its object, the divine wrath against sin: in taking the pain that sin did Him in the spirit of " Father, forgive them," He absorbed its power for evil by making it the occasion of loving the more intensely.

That qualitative perfection of the death on the cross, that once-for-all victory of love unconquered and unconquerable over the forces of evil, left the world in principle a redeemed world. But the reaping of the fruits of that victory, the carrying of its transforming power into every nook and cranny of earthly existence, was to be the work of the Church. In his recently published book, *Jesus and His Church*, Dr Newton Flew has shown how central to the work of our Lord on earth was the commissioning of His Church, and the nature of that commission as received by the Church was summed up in the words ascribed to Him in St John xx, 21: " As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

Two other passages in the Fourth Gospel, superficially but not really in contradiction, interpret the words, " As the Father hath sent me." In ix, 39 Jesus is represented as

saying, " For judgment I am come into this world "; in xii, 47 as saying, " I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." The first passage shows how in one sense judgment was the inevitable consequence of His presence in human history; the witness which He bore to the Father in heaven whom He claimed to represent on earth made it inevitable that sooner or later men should declare themselves either for or against Him, should declare themselves by their deeds if not by their words. But the second passage shows that He was not come in the character of Judge, to pronounce the final verdict. That awful function was indeed to be His: " Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven " (Mark xiv, 62). But that was to be in the future, in the glory to which He must pass by the way of the cross. In His earthly ministry He was not come to judge but to save, to give His life to save men from the judgment which otherwise He would hereafter have to pronounce upon them.

Similarly, the promise to the disciples that they should sit on twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel was explicitly stated to refer to " the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory " (Matt. xix, 28). The Church, in Pauline language, is the body of which the risen, living Christ is the head; its members are His mouth to speak His message, His feet to speed on His errands, His hands to do His deeds. But so long as it is the Church militant here on earth, the work which it is commissioned to carry on is the saving, not the judging work. As the Father sent Him, even so has He sent the Church, and continues through it to carry forward His saving work. Of the Church, as of its Lord, we may say, " For judgment it is come into the world," for wherever the Church is bearing faithful witness to God, the inevitable result will be to force upon men the necessity of choosing between good and evil. But of the Church it must also be said that it is not come to judge the world but to save the world. We must now try to see what this means in practice.

II

We have seen that from as far back as we can trace human history we find man struggling to free himself from evil in its various forms, from ignorance, ugliness, suffering, and

sin. The Bible reveals to us that from as far back as we learn anything of God, we find Him in this struggle on man's side, working his rescue. God is the source of the illumination of the mind through which ignorance gives place to knowledge; He is the source of the craftsman's skill in the fashioning of beauty:[1] He is the healer of the sick, the rescuer of His people from captivity and oppression; He promises a "rest for the people of God." But the central message of the Old Testament is that the root of the problem is sin, and the New Testament shows God in Christ effecting the radical cure of evil by dealing with sin. Yet its other forms are not ignored; Christ commends and enjoins the wisdom of the serpent, rejoices in the beauty of the lilies, and relieves suffering. We must consider what is involved in all this.

The problem presented to God by the sinner is twofold. There is the need of changing the sinner himself, and this must be done without setting aside his freedom to run his own life, the freedom given him by God in willing to create him a man and not a puppet. There is also the need to absorb the sin's power to produce further evil, a power which, when once the sin has been committed, is an objective fact which has passed beyond the sinner's control. Christ, we saw, dealt with this objective power for evil by making it the raw material for increasing the world's output of love, and that objective accomplishment stands as a thing done, whether or no the sinner ever repents. But the love put forth in this accomplished deed can change the sinner in the one way which is consistent with his freedom, for by contemplation of it he can be won to a penitence which is the free response of love to love. This is the climax of God's saving activity. He cares about the temporal welfare of His creation, its rescue from the toils of ignorance, ugliness, and suffering. But precedence must be given to the attack upon sin. It was so given in the earthly life of our Saviour; it must be so given in the continued life of His earthly body, the Church.

It is more than time to turn our attention to the world of the present day, to that "Life of Human Society" with which this paper is supposed to be concerned. Here, still, we find mankind struggling with evil in its various forms: schools, colleges, and learned societies wrestling with ignor-

[1] *E.g.*, Exod. xxxi, 2 *ff.*

ance: artists, educators, anti-litter crusades, and councils for the preservation of this, that, and the other type of amenity wrestling with ugliness; doctors, nurses, and a multitude of organizations for social welfare wrestling with suffering. What should be the relation to all these of the Church, with its deep conviction of the primary importance of dealing with sin?

Let us first try to see the exact sense in which it is true to say that sin is at the root of the problem of human society. We need here to avoid two opposite one-sided errors. On the one hand, a certain type of humanist maintains that human society will never realize its possibilities of happiness for all until it ceases to concern itself with the idea of sin, and concentrates its energies on the development of scientific control over nature.[1] On the other hand, certain religious fanatics seem to maintain that if only we would all allow ourselves to be " changed " by surrendering our lives to be " God-controlled," our social, economic and international problems would be solved overnight. Against the latter of these, I would urge that there are problems in such fields as those of medicine, æsthetics, industry, sociology, and politics which need hard mental work for their solution, which it is unreasonable to expect to have solved for us without that work, or to be solved without long perseverance in such work even under the best conditions. Against the former I would urge that so long as sin is unrecognized as at the root of our problems, and untreated, the conditions are not present for a hopeful prosecution of endeavours to combat ignorance, ugliness, and suffering.

Consider, for example, the social problems which confront us within each nation, and the problems of international politics. It cannot be doubted that if, both individually and corporately, we were free from selfishness, avarice, and pride, the discussion of problems concerning the relations of classes within each nation, and of the nations within the community of mankind, would be placed on an entirely different level from that which now obtains. Problems would remain, problems which would still demand the most rigorous application of our minds to their solution. But the conditions for hopeful progress would be present as they are not now.

[1] *E.g.*, John Dewey in *A Common Faith* (Yale University Press, 1934).

Therefore the first task of the Church, as our Lord's instrument for carrying on His atoning work, must be to call upon men to recognize their own sinfulness and need of forgiveness, and to proclaim that through Christ forgiveness and cleansing from sin are ready and waiting for all who in penitence and faith will confess their sins and receive the divine grace. The Church can never acquiesce in the pessimistic conclusion that human society must and always will be a society of selfish, proud, and avaricious men and women.

Thus the Church, sent by Christ as He was sent by the Father, will carry on the proclamation of His opening message: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." But it cannot stop here, any more than He did. In its life, as in His, there must be the atoning work as well as the prophetic word.

The Church is a corporate body consisting of individual men and women who have heard and responded to the call to penitence and faith, who, cleansed and forgiven, have been incorporated by the crucified, risen and ever-living Christ into the body through which He wills to carry on His atoning work. What does this mean?

We have seen that the essence of our Lord's atoning work on earth lay in His taking the sufferings caused by sin in such a way as to absorb their power for producing further evil and make them the raw material for increasing the world's output of love. In this lies the clue to our understanding of the Church's task in the world. It is still true that sin produces suffering which is a potential cause of evil. Wherever, through the pride and greed and selfishness of men, there are stunted lives and thwarted hopes, malnutrition, disease, or mental distress, there are the potential causes of envy, hatred, bitterness, resentment, the strife of class with class and of nation with nation. But still their power for evil can be absorbed, and they can be made the raw material for increasing the world's output of love, if there exist men and women who will say, "Never mind who is to blame for these sufferings, we will not waste our time and energies in hunting for a scapegoat; here are let loose in the world potential sources of hatred and bitterness and all manner of evils; let it be our privilege in the name of our Lord to be responsible for cutting short their powers for evil and making them bear the fruit of love, though it cost us our time, our money, our energies or even our lives."

The Christian Church is meant by God to be a society of men and women which exists for the purpose of saying and doing this very thing. Churchmanship should mean for all of us that we are baptized into a body membership in which pledges us, both individually and corporately, to be overcoming evil with good as instruments of the living Lord, who is in and through us continuing His redemptive work.

This statement is but the rendering explicit of what has always been implicit in the life of the Church. Why is it that Christian faith has always borne fruit in works of mercy, in almsgiving, education, care of the sick and the poor? Doubtless the first and most obvious answer is that in this the Church follows the example and obeys the commands of its Lord. But this answer only drives the question a stage deeper. Why did the Lord Himself "go about doing good" and command His disciples to do likewise? It was because "doing good" was and is no separable adjunct of Christ's redemptive work and Christian faith. but the essential means and mode of their operation. When He "himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses," He was turning potential causes of evil into occasions for love, and that is the way in which atonement is wrought.

There is thus an intimate connexion between our Lord's repeated command to His followers that they are to forgive as they hope to be forgiven, and His command to imitate the good Samaritan, to "heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils" (Matt. x, 8). Forgiveness, we have seen, is the bearing of injuries in such a way as to absorb their power for evil and make them productive of love. Whether or no the sinner ever repents and is thus in a position to receive the forgiveness, that treatment of the injury by the victim can be, and should be, an objective accomplishment in virtue of which the forgiveness is ready and waiting for him. But what is to be done in the case of suffering which, with all its potentiality for evil, is, so to speak, let loose in a world which does not realize the kind of treatment it needs? It can be laid hold on by one who gives himself to take the infirmities and bear the sicknesses, and in that activity there is an essentially *forgiving* quality.

The philanthropic work of the Church is thus an essential element in its fulfilment of its vocation to be the body of Christ. For Christ is the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, and through His body and its members

He wills to take and bear the infirmities and sicknesses of mankind in the spirit of love. Thus we arrive at the meaning of St Paul's words in Col. i, 24: " I fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church."

III

We must now try to see what this view of the Church's calling and duty will mean for us to-day in actual practice. And first we may notice the contrast between the natural life of man in the world and that to which he is called as a member of Christ. There can be few of us who have not had the experience of sitting as members of boards and committees and, when something has gone wrong, of feeling the natural man rise up within us with delight at being able to say: " That is not my department." So, too, in the world at large, when things go wrong, the great desire of the natural man within us is to find someone else on whom the blame can be fixed so that we can wash our hands of responsibility. But as members of the body of Christ we are called upon to take precisely the opposite attitude. We remember that when the disciples brought before our Lord the man born blind, He turned their attention from attempts to fix the blame for it to the fact that they had before them a piece of the Father's work waiting to be done for Him.[1] We are not to waste our energies in seeking for someone else to blame, we are to ask that we may be allowed to take upon our shoulders the responsibility of doing whatever needs to be done to right the wrong in the spirit of love. And we are to ask to be allowed to do this, not because we claim any merit or capacity of our own, but because we are called and cleansed by Christ that He may use us for this purpose. As St Paul puts it: " Seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not " (2 Cor. iv, 1).

It follows from this that it is the duty of the Church in the world to be seeking to bear the burden of the world's sin and promoting human welfare, and this because it is the will of Christ to be carrying on His atoning work through us. We do not forget that it is the Church's first task to proclaim the message of God's forgiveness in Christ and to

[1] John ix, 1-4.

call sinners to repentance. Nor do we forget that so long as we remain on this earth we need to be continually renewing our penitence and our acceptance of God's grace by faith, or that we are not saved for an earthly paradise, but for the life beyond the grave. But what we are saved for during our membership of the Church militant here on earth is to be used by Christ in His saving service of mankind.

Thus in every parish it is the duty of pastor and congregation to regard themselves as set there by God, not for their own good or for the good of the Church as an institution with interests of its own, but for promoting the welfare of the community in which they live. They will perpetually have to struggle with the temptations provided by the old Adam within themselves, temptations to be interested only in the local population in so far as it is thought of as containing potential recruits for the Church, temptations to think that when scandals arise in the neighbourhood what most needs to be done is to wash their hands of responsibility for them or discover their authors and pronounce judgment upon them. In the light of the New Testament they will recognize these temptations for what they are, resist them in the power of the Spirit of Christ, and seek to bear on their own shoulders the burden of the local sins.

It is in the directly philanthropic work of the Church that the principle I am trying to expound is most clearly seen—in instances, that is, where the sufferings due to human sinfulness are relieved in the spirit of love. But when we have seen this, we see that we cannot stop here. We must return now to the thought of mankind as a whole, struggling with the evils of ignorance, ugliness, and suffering. There is much evil in each of these three fields which cannot be ascribed to any discoverable human sin. Yet here, too, there is evil which is the potential cause of more and more evil, and a whole creation groaning and travailing as it waits for its redemption. Wherever there is ignorance, ugliness, or suffering, there there is work waiting to be done for God, and work which is of an essentially redemptive character. The Christian scholar or scientist who will "shun delights and live laborious days" in the pursuit of truth; the Christian housewife who toils to make her home a place of beauty and peace; the Christian statesman who directs all his energies to promoting the true welfare of his people—these and many others are engaged in the

work of atonement, in redeeming the world from evil by the way of the cross.

Therefore, in every place where there is a Christian congregation, its members will be interested more than the average in all that makes for the increase of knowledge, beauty, and human welfare. Just as they will not waste their time in seeking to assign blame when things go wrong, so, too, they will not stop to bother whether or no they or the Church they belong to gets the credit for what is done well. It is God's work, God's redemptive work, that is waiting to be done, and they will be foremost in readiness to co-operate with whatever organization is seeking to do it, whether it be a business concern, a municipal council, a political party or a sports club. Into whatever department of human activity they enter, they will come as members of the Church through whom Christ is seeking to rescue His world from the chains of evil in all its forms, as men and women who, because they have themselves received mercy, faint not in the service of their Master.

IV

The subject assigned to me was "The Atonement and the Life of Human Society." I have tried to show that, according to the New Testament and the principle involved in the intimate connexion between Christian faith and works of mercy in Christian history, the link between the historic atonement in Palestine two thousand years ago and the life of human society to-day is to be found in the continuing activity of the Church as the body of Christ through which He carries on His redemptive work. In so far as this truth is obscured, it is largely because the Church (and that means you and me) so often fails to be and do what God wills it to be and do. Here, as elsewhere, our intellectual difficulty arises from our failure to practise what we ought to be preaching, and we must amend our ways if we are to clarify our thoughts.

There remains one point on which I must touch before I close. I have spoken of how we are saved by Christ for a life which cannot be perfected here on earth, but only through the grave and gate of death, but also of how, while we are here below, we must work for the rescue of God's world from evil and for the welfare of human society. But, it may be asked, what is the point of all this work if

this earth is such that it can never be the scene of the perfected Kingdom of God, if all we can look forward to is the cataclysm of the Last Judgment?

There is no answer to this question. We simply do not know what is the final purpose of God for His creation, or by what mode of transformation His redemptive activity is to reach its consummation. Some Christians may hold that this earth and life upon it are perfectible and that God will go on creating what time is required for the fulfilment of His purpose through the activity of His Church. Others may hold that only by a cataclysmic transformation can the remaining evil be in the end destroyed, while all that is redeemed is caught up for its perfection in eternity. As the evidence on which to decide this question does not exist, it is one on which we must continue to differ. Meanwhile we walk by faith and not by sight, and our ignorance of the future must not be allowed to blind our eyes to our obvious duty in the present. As the members of the body of Christ, sent by Him as He was sent by the Father, we must give ourselves that He may reproduce in us that way of life which was His on earth, of whom Baron von Hügel wrote: "Jesus cures pain and disease as though they could not be utilized, whilst Jesus also trains and empowers souls to utilize their sufferings as though they were incurable."

LEONARD HODGSON.

Scriptural Evangelism

I

I VENTURE to think that many of the methods of Evangelism that are at present being recommended are merely resuscitations of methods which were popular in the last century, but dropped out of general use because they were found to have little fruitfulness. Further, I believe that they were unfruitful because they were not really sound in principle, but were at variance with the spirit and the method of true Christian Evangelism. Therefore, I desire to draw attention to some points in the evidence which the Gospels and the Acts afford on this subject.

Our Lord preached first in the synagogues, and by request (Luke iv). He adopted "open-air preaching" only

when condemned by the synagogue authorities, and under the pressure of the crowds which thronged him, too great for a building to hold (Mark i, 45). He was regarded as having fulfilled the prophecy: " He shall not strive nor cry, neither shall his voice be heard in the streets " (Matt. xii, 9).

The people came to Him: He did not go to them. " There followed him great multitudes "; " They brought unto him all that were sick "; etc. But He on His part seems never to have sought to gather a crowd around Him to hear Him. Rather, He drew away from crowds (Matt. viii, 18, etc.). He did not advertise Himself. He did not exploit His healings to make disciples. He tried to keep them secret (Matt. ix, 30, etc.).

Similarly, though He continually responded to overtures made to Him by the people for bodily or spiritual help, He seems never to have taken the initiative in any spiritual case (except in the calling of Apostles). He did not seek to " make contacts." Also, He seldom, if ever, " followed up cases "—*e.g.*, the Gadarene demoniac (Mark v, 19); the Samaritan woman (John iv, 28). (Possible exceptions are John v, 14; ix, 35.) While all His preaching was of a challenging character, He did not challenge individuals personally; or call them to a here-and-now decision for or against Him. He offered salvation, and passed on, leaving the judgment of God to be worked out. And He gave no one a second chance who did not accept Him: He did not " keep on at them ": He did not sow again on the same soil, nor stay to watch the growth or decay of the seed—*e.g.*, He did not stay to win over the recalcitrant people of Nazareth (Matt. xiii, 54 *ff.*), or try to persuade the rich ruler to change his mind (Matt. xix, 22).

Our Lord did not make many permanent converts. And we have not even reason to believe that those who joined the Church on and after the day of Pentecost (Acts ii) were those who had listened to His preaching. As a mission-preacher our Lord would be termed nowadays not successful, except by those who measure success by the size of congregations. His methods were not such as were likely to gain many converts. And He himself did not expect to gain many. In His first parable, that of the Sower, He predicted that the genuine converts would be very few indeed (Matt. xiii, 3 *ff.*; cp. Matt. vii, 13 *f.*). His method of teaching by parable, which He adopted after His first proclamation of " Repent ye and believe the gospel," was

deliberately designed to exclude those who were unresponsive, as He himself said (Matt. xiii, 14 *ff.*).

His tone was always "prophetic," authoritative (Matt. vii, 29), denunciatory. It was difficult to understand and to accept. It was very exacting in its demands: "a hard saying; who can hear it?" (John vi, 60, etc.). And He never relaxed the stringency of His demands. He reasserted, rather than explained, those sayings of His that were not understood. He did not try to conciliate opposers. He did not desire popularity for Himself or His followers; He expected persecution (Matt. v, 11; x, 22, etc.). He knew that the gospel would be provocative of trouble and separations: "Not peace, but a sword" (Matt. x, 24).

In His instructions to His apostles, our Lord repeatedly charged them to preach the gospel throughout the whole world. But He never told them to "win souls for Christ." Still less would He have blamed them for "not keeping their congregation together." Rather, He said: "Whoso shall not receive you, or hear your words, shake off the dust of your feet, as a testimony against them" (Matt. x, 14).

Far from urging them to any rash promulgations of gospel-truths, He counselled discretion and reserve: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before the swine" (Matt. vi, 7). He called His apostles to be "fishers of men"; but we must note that that phrase has misguided many as to the right method of evangelism, who have not observed that always in the New Testament the image of fishing is that of fishing with a net, and not of fishing with a line and a bait. A much commoner image of evangelism is that of sowing seed haphazard, which "groweth he knoweth not how," and leaving the result or the no-result to God.

But, on the other hand, it is said by many: "Did not our Lord say that the Son of man goeth after the one lost sheep until He find it?" (Luke xv, 4). And they quote this as the justification of the continual enticement of those who have lapsed, and the using of every sort of enticement. Every modern "mission-method," however vulgar, however futile, is justified by this text. But, in view of our Lord's own example, the text is probably to be interpreted as expressing the value of each soul, and of even one soul (rebuking our lust for numbers), rather than as inculcating a method of evangelism. The Church has usually interpreted the parable as meaning that our Lord left the ninety-nine, the

Angels, to seek the one, mankind, at His Incarnation. Anyway, our English lapsed are not wandering sheep, ignorant of where the fold is, but willing to be brought to it. They know but are not willing. They are prodigal sons, preferring to stay in the far country, and not realizing their hunger: and in the parable of the Prodigal Son, the Father is represented as not going after his son, but awaiting his return at home (Luke xv, 20).

Again, the text is quoted, " Compel them to come in " (Luke xiv, 23), as justifying an ever-nagging " looking-up of " recalcitrants. But the plain meaning of the parable is most significantly against this view. The invited guests, having declined to come to the supper, are not waited for nor pressed to change their minds: nobody urged them to consider what they were missing: nobody tried to increase the attractiveness of the supper-table. They are dropped and the invitation passes from them to ever-wider circles. The gospel is taken from the lapsed, and offered to the heathen.

With regard to the practice of the Apostles, we may note these points: St Peter's first sermons were explanatory in response to inquiry rather than overtures initiated by him. Acts iv, 10 gives an example of a genuine occasion for confessing Christ before men: not self-sought. Acts viii, 26 *ff.* gives an example of how to deal with an individual inquirer in response to his overture.

Acts xiii gives an example of the Pauline method of evangelism. Note " in the synagogue "; by request; on two successive sabbaths only before he left the gainsayers. Verse 46 is most significant: " It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you. But seeing that you thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us."

Acts xiv, 14 is the first instance of an open-air preaching: but it was forced upon Paul by circumstances, not sought by him. Acts xvi, 13 gives the first preaching in Europe. It was in the open air, but at a Jewish place of prayer; not in the midst of a crowded city, and not to the indifferent. Acts xvii, 17 *f.*, " Paul reasoned in the market-place every day with them that met with him," is the only instance in the Acts of the Apostles of what we mean by " open-air preaching." It was sought by St Paul at a time when he was " provoked in spirit," and it led to very poor result.

In Acts xviii, 6-12 we have St Paul's normal method of dealing with the obdurate: no attempt at accommodation; a definite cleavage; an opposition house near to the synagogue; and a long stay, because there were many converts.

II

To bear witness is a primal Christian duty: " Ye shall be my witnesses " (Acts i, 8).

The duty is to be fulfilled (*A*) corporately; (*B*) individually.

(*A*) Corporately, the Church, in each place to which it spreads, bears witness by its maintenance, (*a*) of Christian worship, especially the " shewing forth of the Lord's death "; (*b*) of Christian faith—the deposit of the faith as received from the Apostles; (*c*) of Christian morals within its own membership. With regard to these, note that (*a*) whatever hinders the due performance of reverent worship and whatever tends to put the edification of a congregation before the worship of God is a bad witness to Christ; (*b*) any tampering with the faith of the Catholic Church, any attempt at a " reduced Christianity " to suit the weak-kneed, is bad witness; (*c*) the Church overseas bore good witness by her stringent insistence upon the abandonment of polygamy and adoption of monogamy in each convert from heathenism; and the Church in England has borne bad witness to Christ by its partial condoning of contraception and remarriage after divorce.

(*B*) Individually, every member of the Church has the duty of witness laid upon him or her: the laity quite as much as the clergy.

It is *not* to be fulfilled usually by spoken testimony, even in private; still less so in public. We should indeed be able to give a reason for the hope that is in us to those who are genuinely inquiring—that is, who ask privately; but only " in meekness and fear " (1 Peter iii, 15). We should never pick up a provocative challenge by a mocker or heckler: such are never sincere: the true inquirer comes like Nicodemus. There may be necessary occasions for public confession of our faith before men—*e.g.*, in times of persecution, when sometimes not to confess would be to deny. But, normally, such outspoken testimony is not desirable, and opportunities for it should not be sought. In the mission field, public testifyings to unbelievers are little used, except

in the earliest stages of a mission: still less such testifying to the obdurate or lapsed.

Such public testifying, as for example in "open-air preaching," is almost always harmful, (1) to those who bear witness, especially if young and immature; by insincerity, especially in an oft-repeated testimony, as we have lately seen in the Group Movement; by vanity in the "successful" speakers; and by loss of temper in argument (for few can argue coolly). It is harmful (2) to the cause; because it is difficult to do it effectively; and it is provocative of public ridiculing of Christ and of blasphemy. (If one does that which one knows will provoke blasphemy, is one not guilty? Yet most open-air speakers actually hope to have hecklers!) Anyway, it is not to God's glory, even if the heckler is "downed" by a ready answer. Such answers do not make for reverence or commend the cause of Christ. And it must be generally admitted that open-air preaching has been singularly unfruitful of genuine converts in the past; that it essentially lacks the characteristic Christian reserve; and that it has lowered the preaching of the gospel in the minds of the public to the level of the propaganda of the quack, the tinker, and the tout.

The true methods of individual witness normally are:

1. Consciously, in two ways: by (*a*) individual supporting of the corporate witness—*e.g.*, by personal attendance at church-worship; by aiding in the maintenance of the faith —*e.g.* by class-teaching of children, etc., by encouragement of Christian morality in one's own home; (*b*) by the personal drawing of friend by friend to Christ and His Church. The classical instance of this is that of Andrew who "first findeth his own brother Simon" (John i, 41). He said the least possible; and said it in private; and he brought him to Jesus (not, told him to go). So also Philip with Nathanael: no argument in answer to Nathanael's provocative question, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" but only, "Come and see."

2. Unconsciously: through the effect of the work of grace obviously being done in the souls of the members. Thus wives are to win their husbands (1 Peter iii, 1); through the effect of lives lived consistently with Christian belief and practice; through the effect of those who live up to what they are known to profess, and are plainly the better people for doing so, and the happier and the kinder and sweeter; through the obvious unity and brotherly love that should

exist within the Church, which was very efficacious when it did exist.

(*C*) A special place must be reserved for the method of evangelism by suffering, whether corporate or individual —*e.g.*, by suffering persecution and by suffering loss cheerfully in various ways for Christ's sake. This is to be welcomed, when the opportunity is given to us; but it is not to be sought (Matt. x, 18, 22).

In conclusion, if only the church-attenders were all soundly and sincerely converted people, their witness would happen automatically, and would not need to be organized, but would be sufficient to produce much fruit. They would be as our Lord said they were to be, the salt of the earth, and lights that cannot be hid. Failing such conversion, the organization of witness is futile.

G. D. Carleton.

Close of Cheltenham: Parish Pope.—I

A Study in the Evangelical Background to the Oxford Movement

In October, 1826, the people of Cheltenham received a new incumbent at the hands of Mr Simeon's trustees. He was a young man, only twenty-nine years old, yet recommended by having been an eager pupil of Mr Simeon at Cambridge, and for two years he had been in the town as curate-in-charge of the recently built proprietary church dedicated to the Holy Trinity. This new incumbent was Francis Close, a son of the parsonage but not of an Evangelical parsonage. Fortified by his new position, he soon showed not only his courage but also his views when he took the first opportunity of attacking the local horse-races that had in the past few years become a popular annual event.[1] His onslaught did not abolish the races. It did, however, produce a battle of pamphlets and a tradition of scornful opposition that made Francis Close the stock joke of the large sporting section of Cheltenham society.

This Puritanism, inherited by Close from the earlier

[1] "The Evil Consequences of Attending the Race Course." Sermon preached in Cheltenham parish church, June 17, 1827; also, "Sermon against the Races," 1831.

Evangelicals, grappled not only with horse-racing, but also with another of Cheltenham's fashionable amusements—the theatre. Time and time again the evils of the stage were pilloried. "To purify the drama," he said, "is impossible. If you purify the stage you starve it, and even if the impossible were possible and the stage purified and all objectionable matter withdrawn, it would not contribute to religion and morals."[1] The Puritan assumption is explicit here. All art must justify itself by edifying. Beauty is not able to stand in its own right. Fortune—or was it Providence?—intervened on Close's side, for in 1839 the local theatre was burnt to the ground, and the teaching given from the pulpit of the parish church for thirteen years had permeated Cheltenham sufficiently to ensure that no phœnix rose from the ashes of the Theatre Royal. Strangely enough, though balls were the greatest amusement of Cheltenham society in the season, dancing never fell under such regular condemnation as did the theatre and racing. Possibly Close was temporizing, for he certainly saw the fancy dress ball as a concentration of all the pomps and vanities of this wicked world.[2]

His most successful attempt to enforce Puritanism upon Cheltenham was in the matter of Sabbath observance. A special society was formed in 1839.[3] More than 500 shopkeepers were persuaded to close on Sundays, only comparatively few small, general shops refusing to come into line. The coming of railways (1840) presented a more serious challenge in that it was proposed to run Sunday trains. Close rose to the occasion. The Birmingham and Bristol line ran no Sunday trains to Cheltenham beyond two mail trains for more than six years. In Edinburgh Close was hailed as the Church of England cleric who had secured the best observance of the Sabbath outside Scotland.[4]

With no theatre to satisfy its appetite for the dramatic, Cheltenham consoled itself with the histrionic talent displayed in the pulpit of the parish church. Close was not so much the parish priest as the great preacher of the town. It was from the pulpit that he ruled. When he was preaching the church was always packed. He had to push his way to the pulpit through the people who stood in the aisles, and when he reached his objective he preached for an hour

[1] *Cheltenham Journal*, October 28, 1850. [2] *C.J.*, September 10, 1838.
[3] *C.J.*, December 23, 1839. [4] *C.J.*, November 23, 1840.

or more. His sermons were severely textual in that they were divided, not under the natural heads suggested by the subject, but according to the divisions of the text. This method he inherited from Simeon, who had done so much to revolutionize preaching by making it biblical once more. "Be most solicitous to ascertain from the original and from the context the true, faithful, and primary meaning of every text,"[1] was one of Simeon's maxims which he quoted. Close as a preacher was very pompous, more so than contemporaries like Boyd and F. W. Robertson, who were preaching in Cheltenham at the same time. He was rhetorical; he strained after effect; and yet he was the popular preacher of the town. Boyd, at Christchurch, was more refined and scholarly; Robertson, as assistant curate at that same church, was already showing promise of his Brighton splendour; yet Close was the first favourite in a town which prided itself upon its taste and sensibility. This is extremely significant in view of the charges that the Evangelicals were not scholarly and cultured. Even though they captured resorts of fashionable society such as Bath and Cheltenham, they were still demagogues in grain.

Close's sermons and courses of expository sermons upon which he was so insistent[2] seem to have been effective. Not only did they win for him a despotic power in the town, but some of his childish hearers, who years afterwards were ordained, record that they listened spellbound week by week to his oratory. Others whose staying powers were not so great were rebuked with the query that if two and a half hours, the utmost length of the service at the parish church, was too long to spend in church, how would they endure an eternity of religious worship hereafter?[3]

Close's method of preaching was not all that he learned from Simeon, the master whom he so frequently quoted. He also inherited from him a sturdy churchmanship. Simeon had taught his young men to be loyal admirers of the Prayer Book, and Close was an apt pupil. His first published book was a volume of *Nine Sermons on the Liturgy* (1825). Constantly he spoke of the "all but inspired

[1] "Brief Sketch of the Character and the Last Days of the Rev. Chas. Simeon." Sermon preached November 27, 1836, p. 9. [2] *C.J.*, September 2, 1844. [3] "The Excellence of the Liturgy." Sermon preached at Cheltenham parish church, February 14, 1838, p. 14.

liturgy," a term of high praise when inspiration is deemed the prerogative of one Book only. But in his appreciation there was no liturgical knowledge. The Prayer Book was approved because it is so scriptural—" we draw near to God in the words which He Himself hath chosen "[1]—so congregational, so devotional. Fasting was enjoined upon the people of Cheltenham, especially in the early days of Close's rule before this duty came to be a sign of Tractarian opinions. Before Ash Wednesday there was a reminder as to the duty of fasting—that is, of abstinence from food—details of which were left to the conscience.[2] Holy Week, called Passion Week, was marked by Morning Prayer and sermon each day, and by the muffled ringing of the bells. Holy Days also were observed with Morning Prayer said in the middle of the morning.[3] He spoke of a " Real Presence " quite definitely (though in a Receptionist sense), and that as late as 1847. Transubstantiation is a corruption of " the important, vital, and soul-supporting doctrine of the real spiritual presence of the Lord Jesus with the souls of the faithful in this Holy Supper."[4] Thus Close, in the opening years of his incumbency, was definitely a churchman. When in the matter of education Dissent threatened the Church, he founded a branch of the " Church of England Association " in Cheltenham. The tendency of Dissent to " Liberalism " and " Neology," together with its violence towards the Church, so he explained later, drove Evangelicals in the late twenties and thirties to assume a higher churchmanship than that which had been usual with them heretofore. It was the liberalism and latitudinarianism of Dissent, and not the erudite and patristic instructions of the Tracts, that drove them to this position [5]

It was indeed the movement initiated by the Tracts that destroyed Close's churchmanship. At first Evangelicals were not hostile. Even the *Record* acknowledged the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession.[6] There was, however, a growing fear of Rome noticeable in Close long before he scented danger from the Tracts. He, like Ashley, had supported Emancipation in 1829: " Infidelity, scepticism, and socinian-

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 8. [2] 1841, "The Duty of Fasting," p. 9. [3] *C.J.*, March 9, 1843. [4] " Errors of Romanism the Perversion of Truth." Sermon preached November 5, 1847, p. 16. [5] " Three Lectures on the State of the Parties in the Church of England," Lecture III, p. 47. [6] *Record*, December 12, 1833. See Balleine, *History of the Evangelical Party*, p. 216.

ism are dangers far more imminent than any which need be apprehended from the cumbrous machinery of Popery."[1] But it was not long before he repented of this attitude of supercilious tolerance. He became convinced that the Emancipation Act had inflicted a deadly wound upon true religion. In the attacks made in Parliament upon the Church he saw the iron visage of popery.[2] By 1839 he was roused sufficiently to revive the service on November 5, and to make it an occasion of anti-popish polemics, but it was Rome that he attacked, and not the Tracts. Elsewhere, however, the battle had begun. In 1838 J. B. Sumner, the Evangelical Bishop of Chester, opened the official Evangelical opposition to the Tracts in his Charge. In that same year the proposal to build a memorial to Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer at Oxford was really a challenge to the Tractarians to declare on which side of the Reformation they took their stand. This proposal occasioned Close's first public reference to the Tracts (November, 1838),[3] but even so the November 5 sermon, begun as an annual event in the following year, did not attack the Tractarians directly in its first three discharges. Not till just after the 1840 sermon, when four or five Anglican clergymen had seceded to Rome, did Close "sound the alarm": 1841 was for him the fateful year. Thirty years later Shaftesbury, looking back, wrote of "the outbreak of the Tractarian Movement in 1841-1842."[4] In 1841 Tract 90 was published. "I would not trust the writer of that Tract [Newman] with my purse," declared Close. In late November he attacked the Tractarians openly, being roused to even greater fury by the recent secession to Rome of Silthorpe, whom not many years before he had almost engaged to be curate-in-charge of the new free church he had built.[5] The 1842 Guy Fawkes sermon dealt directly with the heresy of Tractarianism. It was the first one to do so.

In March, 1844, Close entered upon his most spectacular battle with popery in the English Church. In this comparatively minor engagement he led the Protestant forces. Faulkener, the incumbent of St Sepulchre's (the Round

---

[1] "The Christian's Duty at the Present Crisis." A sermon preached February 15, 1829, p. 11. [2] *C.J.*, October 30, 1837. [3] *C.J.*, November 29, 1838. [4] Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury*, p. 207 (Popular Edition, 1892). [5] *C.J.*, November 15, 1841.

Church), Cambridge, appealed at that time to English Protestants for funds to help him restore the church. This restoration was in fact the undoing of all that the Cambridge Camden Society had done in the church at the request of the churchwardens since 1841. They had put in a stone altar, a credence table, a new stone font and a screen. Faulkener wished to replace these by more suitable adornments, including the Ten Commandments on the east wall and the memorial tablets on the other walls, all of which the Camden Society had removed. There was a legal battle to be fought, and for this, as well as for the restoration, Faulkener needed money. Close passed on the appeal to the people of Cheltenham,[1] and set himself to study the works of the Cambridge Camden Society, especially its organ *The Ecclesiologist.* " Popery is taught analytically at Oxford and artistically at Cambridge,"[2] was his discovery. He worked himself up into a fine frenzy and published a pamphlet on " Church Architecture," following it up by a November 5 sermon (1844) which maintained that " the restoration of churches is the restoration of popery." " I am not opposed to the decoration of churches . . . or to anything that is beautiful in architecture, but I am . . . an implacable enemy of all popish and medieval restorations." " The Cambridge Camden Society might have been of great service to the Church if it had adhered to a course purely artistical, endeavouring to revive good taste in the repairs of old churches or the erection of new ones, whilst having regard to the accommodation of worshippers and the peculiarities of Protestant services."[3] The Bishop of Exeter withdrew from the Society and wrote to Close, thanking him for his part in exposing the scandal. The *Record* applauded him as a Protestant hero. The collapse of the Cambridge Camden Society in 1845 and its transformation into the Ecclesiological Society was not, however, due to Close's tracts establishing the identification of its work with Tractarianism, an identity which was obvious when the *Ecclesiologist* became enthusiastic about " piscinæ " and " altars." Rather, it was due to the general collapse of Tractarianism in that year when Newman was obviously about to secede to Rome.

[1] *C.J.*, March 11, 1844. [2] " The Restoration of Churches is the Restoration of Popery." Sermon preached November 5, 1844, p. 4. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 11 *f.*

Close never ceased to oppose popery and Tractarianism with pamphlet and sermon, but after 1847 the hysteria died down. Anti-popery became a normal element in his message: it was something that could be turned on at will. It affected his views upon all ecclesiastical matters, but it was no longer the only interest that he could entertain. In his later years, his opposition to popery became less theological, for those who could be convinced that Rome was the Scarlet Woman were already convinced. His arguments became more political. Rome was intolerant and persecuting; logically Roman Catholics could not be good subjects of a Protestant Queen.[1]

Directly Tractarianism threatened, Close's churchmanship was affected. Popery was the danger, not Dissent.[2] From time to time there were significant phrases to suggest that he had more in common with Dissenters than with Tractarians. Yet the barriers of churchmanship which, at the beginning of the century, had caused Simeon and his friends to form the Church Missionary Society, since the interdenominational London Missionary Society could not do Church work, held good with Close till 1851. In that year those barriers gave way, largely because of the great agitation against papal aggression when Roman Catholic bishops were given dioceses in England. Close joined the "Reformation Society" and the "Gloucestershire Scripture Readers' Association," both interdenominational bodies. He could not, he declared, let a Protestant society hold meetings in Cheltenham without giving it his support. The Scripture Readers' Association took no account of English ecclesiastical organization. Its agents went into every parish, whether or no the incumbent was willing,[3] and preferably where he was not willing, for there they were needed most. After 1851 these men went with the quasi-episcopal blessings of the incumbent of Cheltenham. Close's action in joining these societies was a considerable extension of the principle that had led churchmen to join with Dissenters in the Religious Tract Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society. Simeon and Evangelicals from his time onwards had felt that their churchmanship

[1] "The Sin and Danger of Rebellion." Sermon preached November 5, 1848, p. 17. See also "Popery Destructive of Civil and Religious Liberty." Sermon preached November 5, 1853; "Popish Persecutors," 1852. [2] *C.J.*, February 17, 1851. [3] *C.J.*, December 4, 1852.

would not allow them to co-operate in other than these very general matters.[1] Such scruples broke down with Close in 1851. The Church was not competent to deal with the situation. It was merely minor details of organization that separated him from Dissenters. He displayed himself more zealously Protestant than Anglican.

Opposition to Tractarianism left none of Close's views upon ecclesiastical matters unaffected. In 1847, the same year in which the Bristol Church Union was formed, including amongst its aims the revival of Convocation, Close, in attacking Tractarianism, bemoaned the lack of Convocation and the consequent Erastianism of the Church of England.[2] He even held a meeting on the subject of reviving Convocation.[3] By 1850 his views had changed. He was frightened lest Convocation, if and when it met, should prove to be a means of propagating rather than of putting down Tractarianism.[4] He was therefore opposed to schemes for its revival. The reason for this *volte-face* was that between 1847 and 1850 the Tractarians became even more insistent that Convocation should be revived, seeing in it a possible means of reversing the Gorham judgment. Once a matter was caught up in the controversial whirlwind, both sides saw it as nothing else than as fighting for or against the cause. Controversy poisoned the life of the Victorian Church.

The course that English religion had taken during the hundred years or so preceding this time made conflict, apparently, inevitable when certain neglected aspects of churchmanship should be revived, as they were by the Tractarians. Victorian churchmen went through that strife which had to be before the Church could once more stand firmly on its full traditions and face the new problems the nineteenth century brought with it. For this we owe them more than criticism. The strife took on the form of a battle, and in the heat of the battle both sides failed to

---

[1] *Cf.* February 19, 1847, "The State of the Parties," p. 47. "I think the very proposal of an Evangelical alliance predicates a better feeling between Churchmen and Dissenters, and though I cannot reconcile it to my views of loyalty to my Church to form an alliance with bodies of men whom she considers, ecclesiastically speaking, her enemies, I can rejoice in the good feeling exhibited." [2] "The State of the Parties in the Church of England." Three lectures delivered January following, 1847, p. 50. [3] See *C.J.*, January 17, 1848. [4] See *C.J.*, December 19, 1850, and November 13, 1852.

preserve either a sense of proportion or the spirit of charity. Bitter things and untrue were spoken and written of fellow-churchmen. Eagerness to score controversial points resulted in men on each side looking for faults and fastening on faults, real or imaginary, in the other party. Common ground was often minimized or even denied. Witness to truth, sometimes, was of secondary importance to party position. Traditions and truths were sacrificed to controversy. The failings of Francis Close as a churchman were largely wounds received in this battle of the Victorian Church, and representative of the casualties caused on both sides. From the results of those casualties we are but hardly recovering.

GEOFFREY BERWICK.

Swift and the Modern Mind

THE mind of Swift has been one of the storm-centres of literary criticism for centuries; but, almost until yesterday, those who have taken it in hand to criticize him have forgotten the psychological factor. To Dr Johnson he was a man of one great masterpiece—*The Battle of the Books*—all else that he wrote being of a more or less ephemeral, though perhaps of a brilliant, nature. The man in the street (or perhaps I should say the child in the class-room) knows him best through "Gulliver"; and the Victorian age, which almost invariably slipped up over complex characters, regarded him as a dealer in fantasies. It made a fatal blunder in the case of Swift—as it did in its judgment of Swinburne and of Donne—entirely mistaking the shadow for the substance—the shell for the rich, wild yolk that was all the while within it; and it is for us to rescue Swift from the hands of a generation that never properly understood him.

How far that misunderstanding went—how much it was a part of the very mind of that age—will be gathered from the astonishing parallels that have been suggested. *The True History of Lucian* was said to bear a resemblance to *Gulliver's Travels* because of a certain likeness in design—despite its total difference of purpose. Joshua Barnes' *Gerania*, the *Voyages of Rabelais*, and Voltaire's *Micromegas*, were seriously suggested as the forerunners of Brobdingnag and Lilliput. What the Victorian age missed, and the modern mind has not fully discovered, was the man who

lay beneath so much political invective and human hostility —a man whom *The Journal to Stella* alone proves to have been of flesh and blood, of an unusually sensitive mind, and of a diffident, lovable, and tortured spirit.

There is a measure of excuse for this rather superficial view of Swift—particularly when we remember the limited psychological knowledge of the age in which it was made. To the Victorians, as to many who preceded them, there were no problems—or perhaps it would be truer to say no problems that were not social or religious; and this is why those great ones who were the victim of their own psychology were so largely misunderstood by it. Even such as were of the nineteenth century—Byron, Wilde, and Shelley —were too often praised for that in their output that was least worthy of praise; and the comparatively new-born Blake was, in the last resort, an enigma.

So we can expect misunderstanding for the Irish Dean; and misunderstanding he usually got. There were, of course, elements in his life that, on a surface view, could be made to explain the darkness and bitterness that were at times in him—though even these could scarcely be said to explain all the power and the passion, the loves and the loyalties, that he had to his credit or discredit. He was born to poverty and a measure of squalor in an age of clean-cut social privileges; and if ever there was a man who would have made something of an early cultured environment, that man was Jonathan Swift. All the best of the passion that was in him was gathered during those early years of frustration and impoverishment; but the gold was to be minted in maturity. A good deal of rubbish had been accumulated in the meanwhile; and that is undoubtedly why the metal was seldom, if ever, wholly pure. By this I do not mean to imply that Swift was ever a wool-gatherer in the accepted sense; but a good deal of waywardness and wantonness of his later and greater period display, I am sure, nearly as much of the petulant as the pioneer. His enmity to the Hanoverian Whigs contained only rather less snobbery and party politics than righteousness at their apathy and wilful ignorance.

What I think all alike are apt to overlook in *Gulliver's Travels*, for instance, is the psychological conflict that its author manages therein to crystallize so beautifully; and that large body of bourgeois readers who rate "Gulliver" far above anything else that Swift ever created are in

particular danger of making this mistake. I am not here referring to the symbols of fire, water, weapons of war and palaces that are so freely used therein—though I admit that these have their importance for a psycho-analysis of the story—but to the part in it which the hero plays himself. For was there ever in fiction a more obvious case of bloated inferiority—a case in which all the frustrations of ambition and terrifying phobias of the egotistical unconsciousness were revealed? This diagnosis of "Gulliver" does, I admit, belong to the twentieth century. It contains that seeming contradiction that formed no part in the older psychology that has so often judged, or misjudged, the character of Jonathan Swift. To older generations he had always remained an enigma—one who could make a successful Whig and an even more successful Tory; and one who could prove himself a conscientious and devoted parish priest in early life.

The secret is, I am convinced, to be found in "Gulliver" —the book that has weathered so many storms with such a serene smile and which was regarded as so innocent by our immediate forebears (who were not often guilty of seeing innocence where none was) that it became, with *Rip Van Winkle* and *The Pilgrim's Progress*, the stock product of the Examination Board as well as the show-piece of the school library. Those to whom Swift is little more than a name know him as the creator of Gulliver; and yet I maintain that this gaunt and genial figure would yield more to the psycho-analyst's probings than any amount of delving amid the author's *Journal to Stella*. For Swift was a compound of genius and child—his mind a complex of inflated superiority (as the result of repressed inferiority) and of those fears which cast their shadow upon his early life of poverty and service. The American Carl Van Doren has truly said:

"Jonathan Swift aimed at mankind the most venomous arrow that scorn has ever yet let loose. Mankind, bland abstraction, caught his arrow, laughed at it, and turned it over for children to play with. Children inoculated with *Gulliver's Travels* at an age when it cannot harm them are thereafter innocently immune. If they hear of Swift they recollect their toy, unaware that it was intended to be deadly or that it has still lost little of its furious poison. Mankind, by a stroke so bold that it must have been indifferent, has protected itself. Swift remains a show, the

story of his wild assault fades from the record. Touch the pages of the record, however, and it blazes, a story of fire in a language of ice."

It may be argued that " Gulliver " was but a part of Swift's creation, and that out of the mind that made Brobdingnag and Lilliput came also *The Tale of a Tub* and *The Journal to Stella.* This last, with its pure gold, its irony and spurts of flame, gives us the whole man in a size that no other in his slender output has achieved—not even the poems. There was so much in Swift of deliberate concealment—so much of sheer perversity—that it has taken, I think, several generations of literary critics and a revolution in psychology to unearth the real man beneath it all. Perhaps the mind of the twentieth century cuts rather too near the bone. There is a risk of mutilation—if not actually of amputation; but when we have completed the operation we are still left with the warm sensibility, the flesh-and-blood reality, of *The Journal to Stella.* Here we have Swift sublimated—a large oasis in a life of bitter storm and stress; and Swift's love for " Stella "—though it never achieved the same exquisite spiritual quality as Dante's love for Beatrice—was, I maintain, a great spiritual experience. It probably contained the senses as the nature of man contains that of the animals from which he is descended; but Swift to Stella was a man transformed—whereas Swift in the satirical books was a man enjoying to the full the exploitation of his animal instincts. Only in the case of " Gulliver " was that exploitation without harm.

This conception of the author of *Gulliver's Travels* is in danger of becoming a truism; because while Æsop, Swift, Bunyan, Lamb, Jules Verne, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Kipling, and de la Mare may all be said to appeal to the young, Swift is the only one of that strangely mingled company who does so by a psychological accident—who may actually be said to be *guilty* of doing so. He may be said to belong rather to the company of Apuleius, Cervantes, Donne, and Mr Aldous Huxley—and imagine what a school library would look like adorned with those heroes of satiric letters ! Mr Carl Van Doren has truly said that children are inoculated with " Gulliver " when it cannot harm them; but this is because his creator dreamed where he dared not prophesy, and struck where his wounded childhood had been so often stricken.

In " Gulliver " he could bestride the world like a colossus

among the Lilliputians—creating havoc among their horrid, frightened, comic little souls—an attitude which he adopted throughout life to those who would be called the bourgeois to-day. For in Brobdingnag he could express the unruly fears which infested his own mind night and day—those fears about his own weakness and hopeless inferiority in face of his opponents. The whole thing is a glorious act of compensation—a perfect example of the compensatory fantasy and the unconscious fear in one; and in it we see his unhappy state of arrested development.

Swift was, of course, a great hater; and, like all great haters, he was capable of love to an intense degree. A love of this kind may be variously bestowed; and we owe some of the world's greatest mystical geniuses to what might not unfairly be called "an infinite capacity for sublimating love." Swift might have been of this kind, but not only was that type of religion suspect in his day—at least in Northern Europe—but his whole temperament was wholly alien from it. He was brought up in a Christian Church which, despite a high church wave under Queen Anne that survived spasmodically amid members of the Tory party, was almost clean divided into Protestant and Roman Catholic; and the Protestant Church to which he belonged was too strongly entrenched in the established order to have regarded the more intense forms of mystical experience with anything but distaste. So I think that it is not unlikely that in Swift, with his immense emotional reserves and unusually religious temperament, a great mystic has been lost to the Church.

I cannot help thinking that, like Donne (who became an Anglican by conversion), Swift would have been more at home in the Roman Catholic Church of his day than ever he was in the Anglican; but this would have meant enduring just those social deprivations and political disadvantages that the weaker side of him would have most deplored. He would probably have lived out an attenuated existence in some rural district—at least until the heyday of his literary fame—a neglected knight of Grub Street without even the probability of a spectacular martyrdom. Perish the thought! He would much rather be a lively and revolutionary Anglican prelate—sufficiently out of favour to be the friend of ecclesiastical outcasts and sufficiently among the high-lights to be sure of a hearing. His pen did all that was necessary in regard to that little repression about

the Roman Catholic Church; and so we get some of the ugliest invective that was ever spilt by mortal ink over the Pope, the Counter-Reformation, Transubstantiation, and the Confessional.

It seems to have been an open secret that Swift had doubts and scruples about his ordination into the Church of England—a fact that speaks well for him in an age which showed little enough conscience or sense of vocation where the established religion of the country was concerned. He could have gone from the household of Sir William Temple into the army or the law, with much more than a fair hope of success; but he says of his final decision to be ordained: "I look upon myself, in the capacity of clergyman, to be one appointed by Providence for defending a post assigned to me, and for gaining over as many enemies as I can. Although I think my cause is just, yet one great motive is my submitting to the pleasure of Providence and the laws of my country. . . . To say a man is bound to believe is neither truth nor sense. . . . I am in all opinions to believe according to my own impartial reason; which I am bound to inform and improve, as far as my capacities and opportunities will permit." This is a modest enough testimony to vocation. He did not take, however, what might fairly be called a supernatural view of the Church, but seems to have regarded it at best as an institution that was able to heal political dissensions and enable men to live together in brotherly love. His was an age in which a wealthy Anglican Church afforded good words and good dinners, and in which a bishop was more likely to be praised for the wealth of his wine cellar than for any spiritual gifts! In such an age Swift glows with a certain fierce light.

He enjoyed the high society with which he mingled in later life, not as a snob would have enjoyed it, but as one who had long been denied a natural food. He had, of course, had glimpses of the great during his time of apprenticeship to Sir William Temple, and he seems to have been singled out for rare good fortune in this respect; but, though he was no snob in the vulgar sense, he was ever a victim of his own psychology; and I am convinced that the failure of so many of his biographers to discover the reason for his turbulent dealings with so many of his superiors, in Church and State, is that they ignore the psychological factor. For Swift never forgot his humble beginning. It

pursued him through the light days and the dark days of his singular career. Had he lived in the twentieth century he would almost certainly have been a Marxist !

It is for all these reasons, I am sure, that we shall hunt in vain for the true mind of Swift among his books and among his letters to the great. That is the mistake which our forefathers made; and the result of their search was a strangely composite being—a being compounded of revolution and docility, of reverence for God and of contempt for man made in His image; and Carl Van Doren has said that hate was as natural to Swift as love was natural to St Francis of Assisi. Swift, however, was never easy about his hates. He was not at home in them; and they seem, judging by the unconscious forces which emerge in his fantasies, to have cost him dear. It is enough to know that those powers of hate usually spent their force against those whose allegiance had once attracted him—as in the case of the Whigs when he had joined the Tories—or against those allegiances that might have brought out the best that was in him, as in the case of the Roman Catholic Church. He was, in fact, by temperament and circumstances a case for the analyst, if ever there was one; and we are lucky enough to have preserved in his books the fantasies with which he explored his unconscious mind.

A genuine inquiry into the state of Swift's unconscious life has never been undertaken. This is, of course, partly because that large, dark region of the human mind has been a discovery of the present century, and it may yet prove that the data for such a major operation are not available, or a sufficiently skilled physician of the mind not yet at hand; but I do maintain that such an experiment would be well worth making. It does seem to me quite certain that the easy diagnosis of *Gulliver's Travels* and *The Tale of a Tub*, or *The Battle of the Books*—to say nothing of the Letters and the Poems—only succeeds in shrouding that enigmatic character in yet deeper darkness; and that the superficial, even rather vulgar, treatment of *The Journal to Stella*, to which we have grown accustomed, has missed the man as we might have known him.

It seems, in fact, that Swift's nineteenth-century biographers were particularly unfitted to handle the delicate fabric of his peculiar mind. Scott was, despite his immense stature as a creative artist, an incurable romanticist, and his Memoir of the Irish Dean is tinged with a romanticism

which had no part with his time or temperament. John Forster, though mellower in his day, left his work uncompleted; and Sir Leslie Stephen's biography, though masterly narrative, leaves the depths of his subject unplumbed. The twentieth century, therefore, has inherited a portrait of Jonathan Swift that is unnatural and temperamental, a character that charms but which has never been resolved, and one that is consequently so full of contradictions that he can be made to live at all by only being made to live in half a dozen ways at the same time. Swift, in fact, has been unfairly romanticized and not a little maligned by the way; and I doubt very much whether the modern mind, which abhors romanticism and at least professes to love truth, will be satisfied with such a portrait for long.

It is certainly oddly at variance, and we only have to consider the diagnosis of Swift's love for " Stella " to see how oddly at variance it can be. It is not strange that Swift should be loved by women. His vivid, stormy, petulant, and unstable temperament was one that usually is; but in the majority of cases such men are loved less for their sex than for their instability. They attract the mother in women even more than they do the mate, and it is usually reciprocated for the same reason. In the case of Swift and Stella, however, there was something so much more powerful than either that it is impossible to regard this relationship simply as the fruit of a psychological maladjustment or as a natural *liaison*. It seems to have been one of those rare events in human history of a perfect blending of bodily and spiritual love that romanticists and psychologists alike endeavour to avoid because of what seems to them its dullness. Mr Carl Van Doren says of Jonathan Swift's journey to Ireland on the news of Stella's last illness:

" In a week Swift knew that no matter what he faced he must go to Ireland. Pope, ignorant of the full reason, was so unwilling to lose his friend that he travelled with him to Chester. ' I felt the extreme heat of the weather,' Pope said, ' the inns, the roads, the confinement and closeness of the uneasy coach and wished a hundred times I had either a deanery or a house in my gift to keep Swift in England or to make his journey more comfortable.' But there were no words between them about Stella, and there were no words about her in any of the letters he wrote back to his English friends. Swift, so copiously eloquent about

most of his passions, about this one was as quiet as a stone. Pope, who suspected something, risked only a hint in his wish that ' you may find every friend that you have there in a state you wish him or her.' Talking about everything else in the world the two great wits rode in the uneasy coach to Chester, where Swift was prepared to hear mortal news waiting for him."

For, in Ireland, buried with Stella, was his heart; and I doubt that we shall ever know the true Swift—the man who hid himself from the world—until that heart has been unburied. We have glimpses of it—flashes of insight into its depth—in the letters that he wrote after her death, and the *Journal* itself is not unrevealing. There are moments in it which must reveal a flame to the discerning eye, albeit a flame that was cooled in the ice of discretion! This is neither the place nor, I think, the moment in which to discuss Swift's actual relationship to Stella. The clergy of his day, with all their faults, were seldom immoral in the conventional sense of that ill-used word; but it was an age of flagrant immorality among the laity, so that perhaps the gay, cultured and intellectually flippant society in which Swift moved beyond the cloistered seclusion of his deanery may be excused for supposing a *liaison*. So it will always remain a mystery to some that Swift, if innocent, should have made no attempt to prove himself so; but to expect him to clear himself of a charge against his respectability is, I imagine, just the kind of commonplace misunderstanding that has turned a luminous figure of history into an enigma.

The mind of Jonathan Swift has never yielded to such, but has ever shown a tendency to retreat wherever the probe follows. He is like a dark shadow on the page of history, a man whose secret might have yielded so much but who was willing to yield up all but his secret. Whenever he has been portrayed that portrait has been done in black-and-white, sometimes a brilliant or futile caricature, and sometimes a pen-and-ink study, but more often a plain, straightforward piece of pencil work that has disclosed little more than its author's outline. Never have there been the authentic colours, never the warm flesh and blood of an intimate relationship. We feel, even as we follow him through Sir Leslie Stephen's masterly narrative or Mr Carl Van Doren's more recent approach, that we are chasing a shadow whose substance is always just round the corner;

and never more so than in those moments when he seems almost within our grasp.

There is a hope that such characters will yield up some of their secrets to a new age which has some of the psychologist's weapons at its command; and of Swift it may at any rate be said that he yields well to this treatment, for his greatest work was one of fantasy. If ever a work of English literature bristled with psychological possibilities, that book is *Gulliver's Travels*; and its isolation from all other works of its own day gives to it a human as well as an artistic significance. Would it be going too far to suggest that in the miniatures and gargoyles of that brilliant canvas, when Swift thought he was toying with ideas he was actually laying bare his soul—that when at last he spoke in all his consummate genius there flowed up from the depths of his unconscious mind and into the living pages of his art the true heart-beats of a man whose real loves, fears, petty ambitions and profoundest yearnings have remained a secret? Perhaps under Providence that secret has lain buried until a new age that can fully appreciate and forgive shall unearth it.

For it can hardly be doubted that there was treasure in Swift that has never been revealed beyond a gem of thought here and a sparkling jewel there—usually mined from the same depth; and it is true that he was vindicated. The man who in England changed his political creed often enough to be sure always of being on the unpopular side, and who stormed and raged his life away in Ireland, will not wash, nor will the friend of Addison, Gay, Sheridan, and Pope, who was ready to praise or blame what all outside their circle conversely blamed or praised. A revolutionary who is nothing else will never convince anybody, because the world is old enough to know that nobody is simply a revolutionary. He is usually the victim of his own psychology beyond the normal measure; and Swift, who did nothing by halves, ran that measure to the full. Had that been all, however, he would never have survived his age, still less have been a storm-centre for ages to come after it. He was, as we know, a creative artist of even greater measure; and I maintain that in the world that he created with such a wealth of fantasy and meaning is hidden the man whom all have chased to so little purpose through the centuries.

Ashley Sampson.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Alan Richardson is the Study Secretary of the Student Christian Movement.

Dr Hodgson is the Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology in the University of Oxford and a Canon of Christ Church.

The Rev. G. D. Carleton is the Vicar of Bromley-by-Bow; he was formerly Archdeacon of Modderpoort.

The Rev. Geoffrey Berwick is the Rector of Milton, Cambs.

Mr Sampson is an assistant master at Lawrence House School, St Anne's-on-Sea, and Editor of the Christian Challenge Series of books.

The Rev. J. W. Parker is the Rector of Woodton, Bungay.

The Rev. H. StJ. Hart is Fellow and Chaplain of Queens' College, Cambridge.

The Rev. J. R. Peacey is the Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta.

NOTES

We should like to commend to our readers, and especially, perhaps, to our contributors, a small book by Mr G. V. Carey, entitled *Mind the Stop*, which has recently been published by the Cambridge University Press (3s. 6d.). It deals with the problems of punctuation and with kindred questions in a most engaging manner. The editor of a periodical like this has to decide on the extent to which he ought to secure uniformity of punctuation and of spelling and consistency in the use of initial capital letters. With regard to the last point,[1] we hold that many writers err in the direction of an excessive and careless use of initial capitals, and our policy will be to keep them down to a minimum that is reasonable without being pedantic. Each article ought to follow a consistent usage, but all articles need not follow exactly the same usage. On the other hand, in the case of pronouns referring to God consistency is desirable throughout, and in this matter we propose to continue the policy which was explained by the first editor of Theology (see vol. xv, pp. 25-30).

---

[1] Mr Carey asks why in newspapers alone the names of streets are printed often in this form: "Regent-street," "Portland-place." He says that he has never discovered this usage elsewhere. He is apparently one of those fortunate men who never have occasion to refer to telephone directories. And what about Crockford?

Mr Carey's book is a useful appendix to Fowler's *Modern English Usage*. We do not find either book invariably convincing; but we could wish that all those who send us manuscripts had digested the contents of both. Both books are written in a style which makes them suitable for reading in bed; but it is more important that they should be kept on the desk than by the bedside.

GOD SPEED THE PLOUGH

All is not well with farming. A large number of men go off the land every year, and farmers complain of the dearth of good labourers. Young people do not want to go on the land. In my parish, as in others, arable land has " tumbled down " out of cultivation. What is to be done ?

Scientific research, marketing schemes, better wages, better houses, village halls—these are all to the good, and Christians ought to do all they can to promote them. But by themselves they will not solve the problem. Indeed, they will not achieve their due results unless they arise out of, and depend upon, the one thing needful. The main issue is one of religion. The tillage of the soil is not a mere industry; it is not a branch of commerce. It is a calling, a profession. It deals with the production, not of manufactured commodities, but of life in plants and animals. It must therefore maintain a special contact with the author and sustainer of life, whom we call God. The chief thing which is wrong with our farming is that, in the growth of modern Christianity, the contact with God has been lost and the Religion of the Land has fallen into decay.

From earliest times men have practised worship designed to promote the fertility of the soil. No process in agriculture, from the first clearing of the primeval forest to the bringing home of the reaped crop, has been without its sacrifices and prayers. These vegetation and fertility cults are of the very essential stuff of religion, and have been used with the utmost seriousness of purpose and intensity of emotion. Sometimes human lives have been used in this way—as when in India the Khonds scattered the ashes of their human victim over the land to make the crops grow, or as when the North American Sioux poured into their seed the blood of the maiden whom they had sacrificed as the embodiment of the fertility spirit. The higher religions have always had to reckon with the Religion of the Land with varying degrees of happiness in adjustment. The permeation of Buddhism in Burma by local agricultural rites, and the modern revival of Shinto in Japan in the face of Buddhism and Confucian ethics, show how deep the roots of Land-Religion run. Nor are these crude, and often repulsive, rural rites without bearing upon the highest of all the mysteries of religion.

The myth of the death and rebirth of the god, which underlies so many Spring Festivals, is a foundation upon which God has deigned to build the whole structure of our redemption, in the sacrifice of the death and resurrection of His Son, Jesus Christ. The Religion of the Land ought not, therefore, to be suppressed or superseded, but must be taken up and incorporated into the Religion of the Cross.

Let us review the history of the attempts in the Bible and the Church to do this.

Reading between the lines of the Old Testament, we can trace a struggle among the Israelites between Yahweh's religion and the fertility cults of the local sanctuaries in Palestine which had been used from time immemorial. At first the incoming Israelites seem to have accepted the local Baals for their regular agricultural purposes; for from being nomads they had to learn the farming arts, and these rites were handed on by their Canaanite teachers as a matter of course. But the great dangers of fertility cults in sexual orgies and greed of gain soon began to appear, and the prophets began their struggle to put down the Baals in the interests of moral righteousness and social justice. An expanding appreciation of Yahweh led the prophets to see in Him one who was better able to grant happy and bountiful harvests than the local Baals. But when Israel had come to think of Yahweh as having taken over the divine functions in agriculture, the old moral troubles which were inherent in Baal worship once more appeared, and the country worship of Yahweh became so corrupt that Josiah seems to have tried to abolish it altogether. Then came the exile in Babylon and the transformation of Israel from a nation to a Church. But it proved a Church so austere and puritan that the Jews of the synagogue seem largely to have lost sight of the demand of " the land " for a religion.

In the New Testament there is no direct sign of this demand being met by the New Israel, which is the Church of Christ. The Apostolic Church was a town Church, and the Apostles were mostly fishermen. Jesus was a carpenter, not a farmer. Yet the New Testament estimate of Christ, which has developed into the doctrine of His Person in the Catholic Church, is that in Him all the necessary demands of religion are fully met and satisfied. His sacrifice avails for the whole world of men in their manifold needs. The human need of the products of the field is fundamental: and when the Church spread to country districts, the cry of " the land " for a religion promoting the fertility of the soil and the growth of the crops began to find an answer among Christians. The Church took over, and tried to purify and christianize, the local cults and myths of Europe. The old heathen god was re-established as the Christian saint. But the process was not always successful. Local superstitions

and moral lapses would persist in spite of the Church's discipline and teaching, and the austere and the puritan were for ever in revolt against corruptions arising from the spirit of " the land." In no country has that revolt gone further, or been more successful, than in our own. The Harvest Festival is the only vital remains among us of a Religion of the Land, for Rogation-tide hardly counts in popular practice.

Yet the future holds the promise of better things. We are in a position to try again. Our grasp of the Incarnation has become much stronger, and our appreciation of its significance much larger. The constructive work of our theologians is in process of penetrating to the people. Some day there will come to life among farming folk a Christian idea of Jesus Christ as the living, divine-human link between the controllable and the uncontrollable factors in the tillage of the land. Agriculturists will see in Him the keystone of the arch of all that goes to make up agriculture. And Jesus Christ calls ever to discipleship and membership of His Body. Agricultural workers who have appreciated the Incarnation as it sustains and gives unity to agriculture will come to regard themselves as called of God to their craft no less truly than the priest or the doctor. It is in no small part the absence of the sense of vocation which leads men to forsake the land. The work is so hard, and the conditions so severe, involving so much distasteful and dirty labour, that men cannot be happy in it unless they enter upon it with a conviction of their call to it. But Jesus Christ, understood in terms of Catholic doctrine, can offer a conviction of vocation which has all the value of coming from God. Men inspired by the sense of such a vocation will be able to use the Eucharist as the human extension of the one true Sacrifice in connexion with the processes of agriculture, and they will have faith that Christ will use their scientific temper to prevent the revival of superstition, and His own pure Presence to keep away the moral corruptions which of old brought the Religion of the Land into discredit. And when there is vocation and worship, the Divine Spirit will illuminate the minds of the workers, and bring them into that living sympathy with Nature in her moods and changes out of which the public service of good farming springs. And there will be happiness once more on " the land," which is the mother of us all.

J. W. Parker.

COMMENT ON PERIODICALS

(*a*) Theological

The *Journal of Theological Studies* for April contains an important article by Dr C. D. Broad, in which, continuing his contribution to the previous issue, he discusses the "empirical" arguments for the existence of God. He rejects the argument from design as incapable of restoration after the destructive criticisms of Kant and Hume, and in his article deals only with the argument from specifically religious experience. After admitting the influence of tradition and environment upon the forms of religious experience, Dr Broad brings to bear the criterion which must be applied to all forms of experience, and claims that the experience of religious mystics must be accepted as veridical unless there is positive ground for holding that they are delusive. He dismisses some common arguments for the latter view, and asserts that religious beliefs are not more likely than those of science to be delusive, though "the claim of any particular religion or sect to have complete or final truth . . . seems to me to be too ridiculous to be worth a moment's consideration."

In the *Harvard Divinity School Bulletin*, Professor N. I. Rostovtzeff's Ingersoll Lecture on "The Mentality of the Hellenistic World and the After-life" makes an interesting distinction between the optimistic outlook of the third century B.C. with ruler-cults and τύχη personifications as its main religious manifestations, and its lack of interest in the life to come, and the pessimism of the second and first centuries which produced the inrush of Oriental astrology, the immortality doctrine of Posidonius, and the Mysteries. It may be questioned whether the Mysteries, the Pythagorean or Orphic cults, suffered as much eclipse in the earlier period as is here suggested, and whether there is any real evidence for the view that the Oriental religions of Magna Mater, Mithras, etc., were "transformed into mystery religions by Greeks . . . on the patterns of the Eleusinian, Orphic, and Neo-Pythagorean Mysteries . . . in the second century B.C."

Professor Richard Krautheimer writes in *The Review of Religion* for January on "The Beginning of Early Christian Architecture." He disputes the popular view that the prototype of the Christian church is the basilica alone, and shows on the evidence of the remains of the church of SS. Giovanni e Paolo in Rome that the early practice of meeting for worship in the houses of Christians led to the incorporation in Christian houses of the third century of large meeting-halls with an altar in the middle. After Constantine's accession these halls were isolated as separate buildings and enlarged, as at S. Crisogono in Rome, and S. Croce, where the audience hall of the Sessorian Palace was

adapted for Christian use in the fourth century. The adoption of a modified type of basilica he assigns to the direct influence of Constantine's government. This theory suggests an interesting connexion between the Christian purpose of these buildings and their long association with the divine and all-powerful secular authority, and may afford a valuable sidelight on the syncretism of Christianity with semi-pagan reverence for the emperor under Constantine and his successors.

Turning to the twentieth century, we find in the issue of *Études* of May 20 a survey by Marc le Mondèque of the post-war situation in Spain which seems generally fair and objective. On the religious side he gives an eyewitness account of the enthusiasm with which services and festivals are being celebrated, not only in the original Traditionalist areas, but also in Barcelona; but he expects a continuance or even an intensification of anti-clericalism in the temporal sphere and a rigid demarcation by the predominant Falangist section of Franco's followers of the respective provinces of Church and State. This is, of course, what one would naturally expect in a Spain which, it is becoming increasingly evident, will take its cue in all things from Germany and Italy.

The May *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* contains a learned exposition by Professor Louis Escoula, S.J., of Irenæus's doctrine of the work of the Logos as the revealer of God to man, which he interprets as precluding any knowledge of God on the part of the philosophers.

The same subject forms the ultimate background of E. G. Parrinder's article in the *Expository Times* on the vital question of the Christian attitude to non-Christian religions. The writer, a member of the French Protestant Mission in Dahomey, criticizes Dr Hendrik Kraemer's book, *The Christian Message in a non-Christian World*, a definition for the Madras Conference of the uniqueness of Christianity, written from the anti-humanist standpoint of Brunner, if not of Barthianism. Dr Kraemer's refusal to admit of any extra-biblical " præparatio evangelica," and his insistence that all non-Christian religion is subjective and has as its basic principle " eros," are rightly refuted, and the truth is asserted that " God does speak to all men, of all races, and in all ages." At the same time he fully recognizes that Christianity supplies the essential and final revelation to which other religions point; " Christ is the unique thing about Christianity."

In the same journal the Dean of Exeter expresses an optimistic view of " the spiritual capacity of the plain man," who, he maintains, though he is profoundly ignorant of, and indeed uninterested in, organized religion, has absorbed much of the Gospel ethic, and possesses " a capacity to trust an Admired Person, a capacity to find . . . ideals which seem to have come not from below but from above, and a capacity for membership."

With this eulogy of the ordinary man as he is to-day many will agree; but the question begins to force itself upon the mind, particularly as a result of recent events abroad, whether a population which is becoming increasingly ignorant of the Christian Faith, and can therefore have no sure foundation for its morality, would be able to preserve these pleasant qualities indefinitely if an unchristian ideology were to be disseminated among it with the resources of modern propaganda methods. Racial and national hatreds can be countered only by Christian belief, not by natural geniality.

The revival of the Christian Church will not come, according to Dr Major in the May issue of the *Modern Churchman*, until it recognizes its essential character as a spirit-bearing community, whose most precious possession is not sacramental grace operating through fixed channels, but the inspiration and creative activity of the Holy Spirit which can alone enable it to recover the right scale of Christian values.

G. W. H. Lampe.

(*b*) Literary

"The greatest need of our civilization is such a unification in our view of human experience, a unity in which no major activity of the human mind is sacrificed to others, but is related to others in a way which detracts from the importance of none of them for the well-being of life."—D. G. James in *Scepticism and Poetry*.

All attempts to build up a new order of things out of the present chaos are strivings after a common purpose and ideal by which the different elements in society can be harmonized into a coherent whole. The ultimate aim and object is to establish a unified society. This process has two implications: an analysis of contemporary civilization, a comparatively simple task; and a synthesis or, in this instance, a unification, which is more difficult. If we were all agreed upon the kind of society we want, it would simplify matters considerably. But as we are not agreed we must ask ourselves which we do want, a Christian or a pagan society—and if the former, what precisely does it imply?

These and similar questions are considered by Mr T. S. Eliot in "The Idea of a Christian Society," in the July-September *Purpose*.[1] (This article is a chapter from Mr Eliot's book which is to be published in the autumn.) Mr Eliot believes that our culture is largely negative, but that in so far as it is positive it is still Christian. But, he says, "I do not think that it can remain negative . . . the choice before us is between the formation of a new culture, and the acceptance of a pagan one. Both involve

[1] The C. W. Daniel Co., Ltd., 40, Great Russell Street, W.C. 1. Quarterly. 1s.

radical changes." The Western world has stood chiefly for Liberalism and Democracy. Liberalism, as conceived by Mr Eliot, is a frame of mind, and no one has exposed its meaning more clearly and more effectively than T. E. Hulme in his *Speculations*.[1] The influence of Hulme is the substance of an article by Dixon Wecter (who refers throughout to Mr Roberts' book[2]) in the current issue of the *Southern Review*. (This review, which costs only 75 cents, is published quarterly at the Louisiana State University. It is somewhat similar to *Scrutiny*, though with a wider range of interests, and of a very high standard.) Wecter points out that Hulme saw clearly " the self-sufficient spirit of the Renaissance, the age of romanticism, and the temper of modern science have filled men with a false security . . . and the spirit of the Renaissance has sunk deep into the modern mind." He also stresses what Roberts calls the " tragic " view of Hulme—his recognition of man's sinfulness and the fact that evil exists not only in the world but in ourselves—and that this view only becomes Christian " when the redemptive and penitential motif is added, as, for instance, in T. S. Eliot."

But (to return to Mr Eliot) a further stage has been reached. The attitudes and beliefs of Liberalism are passing away, and " Democracy," the only thing left after Liberalism, is claimed not only by the so-called " democratic " nations, but also by Totalitarianism. On what is the Western world to take its stand now? " The only hopeful course for a society which would thrive and continue its creative activity in the arts of civilization," says Mr Eliot, " is to become Christian." In so doing it must take into account Hulme's " tragic " view—but completed and transcended by the fact of Christ's Redemption.

A unified, creative society is one which is inspired by a Christian ideal and motive. History proves this. Without idealizing the past, we must admit that the Europe of the thirteenth century has a good deal to teach us. For, granting its limitations, it approximated more closely to a Christian society than any other age in history. Then, European culture and the Christian religion were one. The effects of the breakdown of this unity are being felt increasingly. Those who are not necessarily Christian, but are in some sense leaders of culture and the arts, know that something has gone wrong. The artist and the poet feel that they have no real contact with society; something is needed to unify " the complex content of life." Frederic Prokosch's " Poet to Audience " in the June-July number of *Twentieth Century Verse*[3] is significant: " One thing that is certain is that the

[1] Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., Ltd., 1924. 10s. 6d.
[2] *T. E. Hulme*, by Michael Roberts. Faber and Faber, 1938. 10s. 6d.
[3] Published by Julian Symns, 9, Cedars Road, S.W. 4. Twice quarterly. 6d.

loosening and 'revolutionizing' of forms has gone far enough; there is a wilderness of forms lying about; and what is needed now is the application of some sort of intensity . . . to restore sufficient orderliness, dignity, and universality . . . to an era sick of meaningless and abortive experimentation." The phrase "wilderness of forms" summarizes three stages of cultural change: the search for unity, the fact that it has not yet been realized, and the awareness that something is needed to bring it about. It is true that Mr Prokosch writes chiefly with poetry in mind. But what he has to say applies to the rest of the arts. The plea for the restoration of "orderliness, dignity, and universality" is a plea for some unifying force and inspiration by which (to use Mr Eliot's words) "the creative activities in the arts of civilization" can be maintained. It is worth noting that earlier in the same article Mr Prokosch says that the things we all share are "the pangs of love, the pangs of fear, the loss of faith and friends and youth, and death." Whether he connects "the loss of faith" with "the wilderness of forms" is open to conjecture. But the fact remains—that connexion is not subjective; it is objective. It is not a matter of opinion, but a matter of fact.

One of the most acute questions raised by the disintegration of society is: How is the artist to become intelligible to, and understood by, his audience? How does he "get across" to his audience? This particular question was answered to some extent by *Murder in the Cathedral*. But whether it has been answered to the same extent, or whether it was meant to be answered to the same extent, in *The Family Reunion* is a matter which is still being discussed. Various reviews have appeared. In *Purpose* (mentioned earlier) Bro. Every says that the central problem is: "Does the play communicate?" Mr Julian Symons' criticism in *Twentieth Century Verse* is not quite consistent. He tells us that the play was written for no audience at all; for no known audience; for those who share Mr Eliot's faith and fears; and that the audience did not swallow the message. But he does admit that "the greatest virtue of the play is that it gives us an indication of how ordinary language may appropriately be spoken in verse on the stage"—and thus reveals that he is not unaware of the problem of communication. Mr Turnell (a Roman Catholic), in *Scrutiny*,[1] is either ignorant of, or ignores the problem of communication, and, after somewhat superficial criticism, dismisses the play as the worst poem of any pretensions, with the exception of *The Rock*, that Mr Eliot has written. These remarks from the reviews illustrate the questions posed at the beginning of this paragraph. For Mr Eliot's real difficulty was the fact that he was trying to express deep, and what are now largely un-

[1] Deighton Bell and Co., Ltd., Trinity Street, Cambridge. Quarterly. 2s. 6d.

familiar ideas in everyday, conventional language. This difficulty would hardly have arisen in a truly Christian society.

Mr Desmond Hawkins in *The English Weekly*[1] has written one of the best criticisms of *The Family Reunion*. He concentrates mainly on the action, but draws an interesting parallel between Harry and Hamlet: " Mr Eliot has written his own Hamlet. . . . In the character of Harry Mr Eliot has created, not a viable *dramatis persona*, but a myth-figure, a protagonist of the age, a haunting and ubiquitous voice which will trouble us and excite us as the Fausts and Tamburlaines and Hamlets disturbed the Elizabethans." Whether Harry and Faustus can be closely compared is an open question, but such a comparison might be attempted after reading Mr James Smith's brilliant study of Faustus in *Scrutiny*. Mr Smith attaches every importance to the final scene and treats Dr Faustus as both an allegory and morality play. Harry sought flight from the world, or from God. But the sin of Faustus was pride; and it was the ghastliness of this that occupied Marlowe's attention: " Faustus having proclaimed he is not terrified by ' the word damnation,' is overwhelmed by the thing." *Dr Faustus* illustrates to some extent Hulme's " tragic " view of man; and it might be said, with only slight exaggeration, that *The Family Reunion* with its implied emphasis on expiation and penitence completes that view. For hope is born of despair.

Nov. H. Smith, S.S.M.

[1] 7 and 8, Rolls Passage, Chancery Lane, E.C. 4. 6d.

SURVEYS

(A) SOME RECENT BOOKS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT AND KINDRED TOPICS

THE constant making of many books on Old Testament subjects indicates both the large hold which they have on contemporary interest, which is in itself perhaps remarkable, and also the size to which these studies have grown in modern times. The writer of a survey such as this must accordingly feel most unlike Alexander Selkirk. He is in fact endeavouring to treat as one field in the realm of scholarship a large estate which has long ago paid its death duties and is now divided into numerous small holdings. These have each their own specialists, and would seem therefore to demand separate surveys. But the case is happily modified by the object which the editor of THEOLOGY has in publishing these surveys. It is to try to provide some sort of a guide to the perplexed who, as they are supposed not to be specialists at all, and can scarcely publicly be provided with a list of books which need not be read (what a useful document that would be !), desire but to be advised what books may help them to understand the Bible, and what will keep them informed of work and even progress in Old Testament studies.

With such an aim in view, pride of place clearly belongs to Professor H. H. Rowley's little book, *Israel's Mission to the World* (S.C.M. Press, 3s. 6d.). This book contains four lectures which Professor Rowley delivered as a course in the Vacation Term for Biblical Study at Oxford in August, 1938. Professor Rowley's aim is not so much to increase the amount of available knowledge as to excite enthusiasm for the legacy of Israel in the important centuries following the Babylonian exile. In this purpose he succeeds excellently, and his book will be valued not only by teachers of the Old Testament but by any who would understand the preamble to the New Testament as well. His main theme is that Universalism in Hebrew religion is the child of the captivity and that Particularism was its necessary and not altogether unkindly nurse. The first lecture, " The Wider Vision," claims for the post-exilic period the key to the understanding of the achievements of Hebrew religion, and protests against overmuch preoccupation with the pre-exilic period. Dr Rowley then makes some reference to the adumbrations of Universalism in the elder prophets, and proceeds copiously to illustrate it in full blossom in the second Isaiah, in whom he finds his title of " Israel's mission to the world." The doctrine that " the grace of God was far too rich to be exhausted in His goodness to Israel," but that through Israel His kingdom will be established in the world, is further demonstrated from the

later chapters of Isaiah, from Malachi, Jonah, and the Psalter (disappointingly omitting Psalm lxxxvii). The Book of Ruth is reserved for Lecture II, " Particularism and Proselytism," which illustrates the necessity of making a fence round the Torah (as the later Rabbis said) if the distinctive features of Judaism were to survive in the ancient world. No particularism, no proselytism, for without particularism Judaism would have been swamped in the great world outside, whom it accordingly could not convert to true religion. The Book of Ruth is not, as is usually said, a protest against particularism, which points out that King David (of ever-increasingly venerated memory) had Moabite blood in his veins, but—*au contraire*—a tract written to show that only a full proselyte (and such Dr Rowley regards Ruth when she came to the land of Yahweh) could marry into the chosen race. The rest of this most interesting chapter is devoted to the progress of proselytism in its protective shell through the Greek period to New Testament times. Lecture III, " Aggression through Christianity," while saying much in praise of the Pharisees, treats them as ultimately more interested in particularism than in proselytism, and shows that Christianity, inheriting the universalism and proselytism of the Old Covenant, so exercised " the world mission of Judaism to a degree that Judaism has never attained." In the last lecture, " Israel's Enduring Contribution to the World," Dr Rowley briefly discusses our debt to the chosen race, finding it most chiefly to lie in the idea of the close relationship between religion and conduct which was the essential by-product of the ethical conception of a gracious and merciful God, in the idea that God works in history, in spiritual worship, and lastly and more generally " in the imperishable literature of the Old Testament." Dr Rowley's book well shows that the specialist is the right person to write a popular work.

If *Israel's Mission to the World* assists us to understand the Bible, the three lectures by Professor J. Coppens, entitled *L'histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament* (Casterman, Paris, fr. 12), are equally useful to the perhaps more limited number who would understand the history of Old Testament criticism. Mr Parker has already drawn attention to this book in this journal (article on Rome and Biblical criticism, THEOLOGY, July, 1939, pp. 14 *ff.*), and has pointed its interest for the contemporary Roman attitude to Biblical criticism. That attitude, Mr Parker urged, was " look before you leap," and it is certainly very well preserved by Professor Coppens. The lectures are on Old Testament criticism, past (from Eichhorn, 1752-1827, to Wellhausen and his school [roughly to the war]), present (since Wellhausen), and future. Of these the first two are the most generally useful. The book, itself a skilful summary, defies summary, and will be welcomed (for it is very fully documented) as a short bibliography and

history of Old Testament criticism. Professor Coppens' main theme is that the reconstruction of Old Testament history and religion made possible by Wellhausen's solution of the documentary problems (particularly of the Hexateuch—*i.e.*,Genesis-Joshua) requires more modification after the last thirty years (which have seen the application of new methods of study to the Biblical documents themselves, and a very great increase in our knowledge of the Ancient Orient, the context of the Old Testament) than is yet realized, because no work of synthesis has yet been attempted on a large scale.

Among commentaries those who have little or no Hebrew will find much of real help in Father Lattey's annotated translation of the first book of the Psalms, *i.e.* Psalms i-xli (*The First Book of the Psalms*, Longmans, 5s. 6d.), which has very useful notes on matters of vocabulary and on the variants in the ancient versions, but does not always see eye-to-eye with Protestant criticism on questions of authorship. Of more specialized interest are two new parts of Dr Eissfeldt's *Handbuch zum Alten Testament* (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen). In *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten—II, Nahum bis Maleachi* (R.M. 4.80), Horst completes the commentary on the Minor Prophets of which the first half (Hosea-Micah) was written by Dr T. H. Robinson. The second addition is the Wisdom of Solomon (*Weisheit Salomos*, von Johannes Fichtner, R.M. 2.90), and is particularly interesting as the first important Protestant commentary on the greatest of the Greek Wisdom books since the new work on the Wisdom Literature began after the war, work in which Professor Fichtner has played a distinguished part.

Some slighter works remain, and some less directly concerned with the study of the Old Testament. *The Book of the Ways of God* (by F. G. Kraeling, S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d.) is an examination of the Book of Job designed to act as intermediary between the scholar and the general reader. The book contains also an elaborate analysis of Job, a useful bibliography, and eight reproductions of Blake's illustrations (which are perhaps the best commentary on the Book of Job yet available). *The Oracles of Jacob and Balaam* (by E. Burrows, S.J., the Bellarmine Series iii, Burns Oates, 12s. 6d.) is an exact and careful work published posthumously. Part I is concerned with Babylonian Uranography in the oracles of Jacob, and Part II with the influence of the oracles of Jacob on Messianic prophecy. *The Old Testament*, by the same publisher (7s. 6d.), is a collection of papers read at the Summer School of Catholic Studies held in Cambridge in 1938. These papers cover, albeit of necessity very briefly, the whole field of Old Testament studies in a popular manner. One of the most attractive is that by Father Lattey on the Psalter. Father Lattey also writes the preface. *Biblical Archæology: its Use and Abuse* (by G. H. Richardson, James Clarke,

3s. 6d.) is a work by a writer of enthusiasm who has been much in America at a time when Fundamentalist controversies were fierce, designed to demonstrate that archæology is no ally of Fundamentalism. *History of the Jews* (by Paul Goodman, Dent, 5s.) is a new edition of a work first published thirty years ago, now printed again *à propos* of the current wave of anti-Semitism. Only the first two chapters are concerned with the Old Testament, but the story is carried down to the present day with two additional chapters animadverting to the Great War, Russia, Italy, and modern Germany. *In the Steps of Moses the Lawgiver* (by Louis Golding, Religious Book Club, no price) is good light reading and contains many photographs of views and sites in Bible lands.

Although not our direct concern here, and certainly not a popular work, *Kalilah and Dimnah*, by Elinor Husselman (Studies and Documents, edited by Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake, No. x, Christophers, 8s. 6d.), a model publication of a Greek fragment of Kalilah and Dimnah from MS. 397 in the Pierpont Morgan Library, with text and photographs, is a little work which will commend itself to any who are interested in the tall stories of antiquity. Much useful knowledge is also to be found in *The Synagogue Lectionary and the New Testament* (R. G. Finch, S.P.C.K., 6s.), which belongs really to New Testament exegesis. It is a careful exploration of the use of the three-year cycle synagogue lectionary as a clue in the study of New Testament chronology. But it is also important for the history of the use of the Hebrew Bible, and every young Hebraist who trespasses only with fear, trembling, and the help of Levi's dictionary into post-Biblical Hebrew will be pleased with the concluding chapter, which is a translation of a Rabbinic sermon on Isaiah xl, 1, from the Pesiqta de-Rab Kahana.

We are asked also to draw attention to two other works. Of these the first is an English translation by J. E. Turner of three works of translation by Rudolf Otto, under the title, *The Original Gītā, the Song of the Supreme Exalted One* (with copious notes, etc., Allen and Unwin, 15s.). Its six main headings are: (1) The Original Gītā, (2) Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītā, (3) Yoga and the Yogins, (4) The Original Form of the Bhagavad-Gītā, (5) The Doctrinal Treatises of the Second Part of the Bhagavad-Gītā i-iv, (6) The Treatises of the First Part of the Gītā v-viii. The second is volume two of *The Qur'ān* (translated, with a critical rearrangement of the Surahs, in two volumes, by Richard Bell, T. and T. Clark, vol. ii, 12s. 6d.). This volume contains Surahs xxv-cxiv.

H. StJ. Hart.

(B) INDIA

Re-thinking Christianity in India. Published by A. N. Sudarisanam, 8, Baracali Road, Kilpauk, Madras. Rs. 2/8. Dr Goudge in *The Church of England and Reunion* (S.P.C.K., 1938) asserted that the time has come when the cause of Reunion will be best served not by "eirenicons" and carefully phrased formulas of agreement, but by each side stating bluntly in what respects and why it disagrees. His challenge, written from the point of view of the liberal Catholic, has not had to wait long for an answer. The above volume was prepared, in a hurry, as the authors explain, by seven South Indian Christians in preparation for the Tambaram Conference, and, though there may be marks of haste, there are none of doubt or of diffidence, and the power of expression is both arresting and stimulating from cover to cover. The approach is frankly Protestant; and, if there be sense in Simeon's dictum that "the truth is not in the middle, and not in one extreme, but in both extremes," then the reader will be much benefited by reading both volumes.

Re-thinking Christianity in India consists of eleven articles dealing with such varied subjects as "The Christian Movement in India," "Jesus and Non-Christian Faiths," "The Church," "The South Indian Church Union Movement," "Religion in Contemporary India," and "Ashrams," whilst in an appendix there is a most capable and critical review of Dr Kraemer's great book *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World.* But, then, all the articles are capable. There is no question of the mental brilliance of these seven writers—C. V. Job, P. Cherchial, V. Chakkarai, D. N. Devasahayan, S. Jesudaser, E. Asirvatham, and A. N. Sudarasanam—who, according to the preface, have been associated together for twenty-five years, even though I find myself in disagreement with a large proportion of what they say, and by no means all their views are shared by the mass of Indian Christians.

It is a book by keenly patriotic Indians, and this too colours the whole work. And it is a book by Protestants, individualistic to a man, and by converts from Hinduism, which is religiously as all-inclusive and accommodating as socially it is exclusive. This probably is the dominating influence. It is this background of the priesthood of the laity, the glory of Mother India, and the rich heritage of Indian thought and culture, which both makes and mars the whole book.

For, in the first place, it is in some respects an ignorant book. It might have been written by an English layman(!), so assured is it of the advantages of the amateur.

"The Priest has a knowledge of Church history which warps his normal vision . . . the layman sees otherwise. Fortunately he has no knowledge of Church history. He does not know

doctrines—at least in India." And again: "Those who are acquainted with the Nicene Creed have no need of it." "It (the Church) cannot be built upon outworn creeds, borrowed theology, alien ceremonials, sacerdotalism and priestcraft . . . that does not mean that there will be no creed, no sacrament, no priesthood, no polity. But that will be made and broken and made again." "As for the heritage," says Mr Job, "the Christian Indian accepts the principle, the more the merrier," and Mr Chakkarai supports this sentiment in the words: "Extravagances there may be and are, but this freedom is essential, and is in line with Indian Catholic genius . . . India prefers the mystical to the logical, the spiritual to the historical . . . there are more forms of Hinduism than there are churches and sects in the west." And in conclusion: "The Christian in India, and for this he may praise the Lord with a full heart, has yet no Church or theology which he feels bound to defend or maintain." But to those of us who have been nurtured in a longer tradition of Christianity (it is nothing to do with the "west") it is just this deplorable lack of instruction in Christian doctrine and worship and in the meaning of Church membership which is the most serious danger to Indian Christianity. It is true that the average Indian educated layman is as ignorant of the elements of the faith which he professes as is his English counterpart of the faith which he no longer pretends to profess, though, fortunately, it is not equally true of the rural Church, which comprises the vast majority. Nevertheless, it is a serious danger. For what really inspires such remarks as the above is the authors' unconscious Hindu inheritance, with its encouragement of speculation and superb philosophy and its scorn of facts. But Christianity is an historical religion. Its crucial message is not what man has discovered about God, but what God has discovered to man.

The Christian faith is based on God's act at a particular place and time. And, therefore, the Christian's first need is not to invent a new Christianity of his own, but to be instructed in the Truth which was revealed 1,900 years ago, and which is enshrined in the creeds and in the Bible. "We are Christians," writes Archbishop Temple in his latest book, *Readings from St John's Gospel*, "because we have been taught, and those who taught us were taught themselves; so the line runs back to Christ and those about Him." And he goes on: "The difference between east and west, which we so easily regard as geographical and racial, is really, as Mr Edwyn Bevan has pointed out, a difference between those who have and those who have not come under the influence of the Bible. Lofty moral philosophy for the few and great moral degradation of popular religion was no less a feature of Greek religion than of Hinduism." This appeal of the authors for a new Indian

interpretation of Christianity, as wide as it is tolerant, is the old appeal of Gnosticism, which so nearly undermined the Church in the second century. The answer given then is just as important to-day, namely that our religion is based on an historical revelation—a simple fact for simple men; hence the stress on the apostolic succession of tradition and the growth of creeds —and not on an intelligentsia's philosophical musings.

Precisely the same defect is seen in the authors' attitude to the Church, and to the South India Church Union scheme in particular, which they are out to wreck. Indeed, they openly boast that two of their number were responsible for the demand put forward at the last meeting of the South India United Church for immediate intercommunion before the introduction of the scheme, and a boycott is recommended of any minister who refuses to agree to communicate all who come.

And why? Because the Church simply fails to interest them. "The unity of the Church of Christ is a spiritual reality that is an article of faith for every Christian. It is, however, too sublime to find expression in a single order of worship or even of formulas of faith." Mr Cherchial wants a commission to investigate what form of Church union is most suited to India, and favours a federation as the limit of organic union. "Union," he says, "is not amalgamation, is not structural alteration, but the feeling of brotherliness." We can have no fixed attitude towards the Church. We may retain it as a secondary institution; and he supports his attitude by such extraordinary statements as that "there was no Church in the Jewish religious economy"; "nobody demanded a confession of faith or the creed from the worshipper"; "the Church among the Jews never carried the message of God to the world"; "in Jesus' world there was no place for a Church." The early "disciples had no thought of a Church when the Master lived—not even after his death, when they were led by the Spirit." One is left wondering what exactly Mr Cherchial makes of "the congregation of Israel" in the Old Testament, or of the recitation of the "Shema" in the worship of the synagogue, or of the fact that most of St Paul's converts came from among those whom the Jews had already proselytized, or of our Lord's own statements, such as: "Ye compass land and sea to make one proselyte"; or, "Upon this rock will I build my Church." Very outworn nowadays sound the old *clichés* that the eucharist is "probably a pagan ritual in its present form," the result of the influence of the Greek mystery religions, or that "Jesus as portrayed in the Gospels is less than God. He says so explicitly." Their untruth has been proved beyond doubt by such writers as Sir Edwyn Hoskyns in *The Riddle of the New Testament*, and Bishop Gore. But they are none the less dangerous for that, and inevitably culminate in some form of eclectic theosophy.

The conclusion is not unexpected, that Christianity is only one of several religions, equally good, which lead to God, and that " the future Indian may divide his homage between Hinduism and Christianity," for Christianity must be a movement in the Hindu fold rather than a society outside it. But, meanwhile, the scholars have proved conclusively that this " humanitarian Jesus," making no claims or demands except to bring in an ethical kingdom, is a fiction of the German Liberal Protestants. The Gospels were written because men had come to believe that Jesus was God. St Mark's Gospel no less than St John's is based throughout on the divinity of Christ. It may be unpopular doctrine, it may be incredible, no less than the teaching that we are all " baptized into one body," or that on the first day of Pentecost the converts " continued steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers," but it is the essence of Christianity. If we dislike it, we can reject it; but we have no right to build a castle of what Sir Edwyn Hoskyns calls " spiritual romanticism," and modern psychologists " wish-thinking," in its place.

It may appear a slight to Englishmen and Germans no less than to Indians that God should have revealed Himself through a Jewish culture rather than through their own, but it is the fact, a fact on which to-day almost all scholars are agreed. By all means Christianity must be interpreted to the Indian, no less than to the Chinese or to the African, in thought, forms, and idioms that he can understand; any and every point of contact must be seized upon in his previous religion as supplied for this purpose by the Holy Spirit, to lead him to Christ. But the foundation on which Christianity must be built is the history and experience of the Jews, on which Christ Himself based all His teaching, and into which He Himself was born " in the fulness of time," and not the history and experience of any other race. " To come to Him," writes Archbishop Temple, " is always an act of self-surrender as well as of self-fulfilment, and must be first experienced as self-surrender." So the great early Fathers—Justin Martyr, Origen, Augustine—each in turn brought to Christ the treasures of other philosophies and cultures, and had them enriched, not by the illuminating of Christ through them, but through the illuminating of them through Christ.

Finally, the authors of this book will find us all in agreement with them in their plea for a truly Indian expression of Christian life and worship. Indeed, as they themselves admit, the missionaries are ahead of the urban congregations in their zeal for this. But most of us would go further than this. We must work for organic union, for a Church which is not merely national but something far better, the national expression of the Catholic (world-wide) Church. We are told that the Christian

Church to-day is suspect in India as "an outpost of imperialism," and the national Church of Germany or of any other country is but a reflection of the nation. How could an Indian National Church escape the same criticism? Only by being an Indian expression of the One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, which is no "western institution," and is represented in the long tradition of the Eastern Church no less than in the west. And such organic union in India is a matter of life or death. As that gallant soldier, Herbert Edwards, wrote over a century ago, "Differences about bishops look very small under the shadow of an idol with twelve heads." Nevertheless these differences exist. One can have every patience with the impatience of the Indian Christian, who points out that these differences are none of his making, that through a mere coincidence of geography his wife is a Baptist, his father a Presbyterian, and himself a Lutheran, and that this disunion is a grievous hindrance to his witnessing for Christ. But the differences will not be solved by ignoring them. All differences of belief stand for some truth, some reality. They will be solved only when they are transcended by a greater common belief, in which the differences are but partial truths. They will be solved only by a return to the full primitive Catholic faith.

A leading delegate to the Tambaram Conference wrote to an Indian friend of mine on his return to Europe: "The supreme need of the Indian Christian at this hour is to study the meaning of the Church." This book re-emphasizes the urgency of that need. Bishop Gore's celebrated remark, "I sometimes have a feeling that I feel we all feel," is not enough as a creed—he would have been the last to use it. The total eclipse of Christianity is no new thing in eastern countries, nor will be in western, maybe, in a few years.

Any Christianity that will last must be built upon a bedrock of fact.

I am reminded of a telling paragraph by C. E. Vulliamy in his *Life of John Wesley*: "Spirits are not commonly perceptible or effective unless they have bodies, and no religion can live long without the codes, the guidance, and the outward solidity of a church. True, the spirit may be overcome by the body; the Church may miserably collapse under the dead load of its own tradition; yet there can never be a lasting faith without substance or without its appropriate doctrine, legend, rules, rituals, and architecture."

J. R. Peacey.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIANITY AND MORALS. By Edward Westermarck. Kegan Paul. 21s.

Whatever one's personal predilections in questions of faith and morals, and however adversely one may react to the frank expression of clean contrary convictions, one cannot keep one's intellectual honesty and at the same time fail to admire either the vast mass of erudition that has gone to the making of this book or the masterly manner in which the material is handled. Like much of the author's previous work, it has affinities both in range and treatment with the works of Herbert Spencer and of Frazer; in the tone of its thinking it is reminiscent to some extent of the recent thought of Aldous Huxley. The author's range of knowledge in the history of theological thought is immense, but he is almost equally at home in the realm of scientific research: zoology, anthropology, and comparative religion have each their contribution to make, and the choice bespeaks the discrimination of a penetrating explorer in each of these fields of learning.

In a sense the book is beyond criticism. If one accepts the main conclusions of its author (and they are conclusions rather than premisses) that ethos and nomos, mos and lex, are synonymous terms; that all so-called moral judgments (duty) are simply expressions of disinterested retributive emotion, themselves non-moral in origin; that they implicitly contain prohibitions, for " nobody would have ever dreamt of laying down a moral rule if the idea of its transgression had not presented itself to the mind," then the rest of the argument follows inevitably. In his analysis of convictions to the contrary, perhaps the most pungent remarks occur in a passage (pp. 31-39) where he ruthlessly unmasks much shallow thinking—quasi-philosophical and theological—and exposes it for what it is, mere ingenious apologetic. He disposes of the theory that moral ideas possess objective validity—whether regarded as self-evident principles perceived by intuition or as imparted by divine revelation—on the ground that the variability of moral valuation, not only in quality but also in degree, even between expert moralists, is too extreme to warrant such an assumption.

In this he may perhaps be detected in an inconsistency, since in subsequent chapters he is at pains to exhibit the striking parallels that exist between the precepts of our Lord and those of the great world teachers. The one fact is certainly as obvious as the other, and is a serious blow to the persuasion that moral standards are wholly relative and subjective. Diversity in types of ethical theory between moralists is one thing; quite

another is unanimity in precept and example among those who live on the higher levels. The author makes much of the retributive element in the moral teaching of Jesus (which apologists have been too prone to gloss). He reduces it " not only to hedonism, but to egoistic hedonism as defined by Sidgwick," but he does not note the quality of the self-interest implied, or allow that the reward involves a total transvaluation of all accepted values; or for the fact that there is promised no exact proportion between effort and reward; or that there is a total exclusion of all human ideas of merit in the divine assessment; or that in the discourse ending " inasmuch " the meritorious were *unconscious* of their merit. But on this and all such disputations a remark of Lawrence of Arabia—which comes as a rebuke no less to the academic believer than to the sceptic—may not be without point: " The tang of humanity and real love that made the distinction of Christ's music . . . suffered sea-changes . . . from the abstraction of Alexandrian bookishness into Latin prose . . . and last and most terrible passing of all, when it became Teuton, with a formal synthesis to suit our chilly disputatious north."

Dr Westermarck devotes a chapter to the Ethics of Paul. He seems to find a difficulty in unravelling them from, or reconciling them with, the apostle's doctrine of justification by faith (his special *bête noir*), and for the most part he is content to follow the leading of critics like Weiss, Wrede, and Montefiore. But he is conscious of traversing a much more complicated field of inquiry than the plain country of the synoptic gospels, and of breathing a different atmosphere. One remark, illustrative of this, will bear quotation: " The centre of Paul's Christianity is the doctrine of redemption through the crucified and risen Christ. He never speaks of Jesus as a teacher or of His teaching, he extremely seldom appeals to any words of Jesus as a moral norm, he never refers to his example of life in any concrete situation."

He finds echoes of the same apparent irreconcilability between faith and works in the sub-apostolic writings, leading on to that between predestination and free-will in the Early Fathers, till it hardens into the great dilemma with which Augustine and his successors found themselves faced.[1] On this well-worn ground Dr. Westermarck has little of original comment to make, but marshals his facts concisely and comprehensively. He steers his way with precision through the labyrinthine ways

[1] Somewhat surprisingly he refrains from noticing that exactly the same problem, reached by similar stages, confronted Al-Ashari and the Mutazilites in the Moslem controversy. But it must be common to other systems of theology also. It is certainly apparent in Hinduism in the rival sects of Vishnuites.

of scholasticism, searching therein for some gleams of moral consciousness but finding any such obscured for the most part in the mists of metaphysical subtleties, and each of the various schemes of atonement alike repugnant to the moral sense. "To the Catholic theologian the atonement only forms the basis of the whole system of ecclesiastical machinery upon which man's salvation is supposed to depend. To the Protestant it is his warrant for rejecting this machinery as superfluous. . . . From a moral point of view Pelagianism is superior to the doctrines of both." The context of such harsh-sounding passages as this is worth pondering, but it is beyond the scope of a review.

The same must be said of the concluding chapters of the book, which comprise a masterly survey of the history of thought and practice, Christian and other, on moral questions of perennial interest, because of their practical importance: but this may be added—probably these topics have never before been subjected to a more intensive scrutiny or documented with greater detail and thoroughness.

For summary, a few sentences must suffice to indicate the author's position. "There would have been no Paul without Christ, but there would have been no Christianity without Paul." "While Jesus was a moralist, Paul was in the first place a theologian." "The highest regard for truth is not to profess it, but to seek for it." "The patient and impartial search after hidden truth, for the sake of truth alone, which constitutes the essence of scientific research, is of course the very opposite of that ready acceptance of a revealed truth for the sake of eternal salvation, which has been insisted on by the Churches."

To the dogmatic theologian this book presents a formidable challenge, since the arguments it raises are by no means foreclosed; whilst the Christian believer must needs ask himself—How much of my faith is traditional, how much ratiocinative, how much sentimental, and how much really springs from the heart of living experience?

GEORGE SEAVER.

THE INDWELLING GOD: A HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF DIVINE IMMANENCE AND INCARNATION, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO INDIAN THOUGHT. By E. C. Dewick. Oxford University Press. 10s. 6d.

Mr Dewick's historical study is a scholarly contribution to a subject of first importance at the present time. The belief, expressed by the term Divine Immanence, that the Creator is active within His creation, everywhere and always present, is a belief that has been affirmed by Christian teachers throughout the ages. But in general it has occupied a subordinate place. It is, as Bishop Gore observed, secondary or derivative.

At the beginning of the present century, however, several

causes contributed to give the belief greater prominence in Anglican theology. There was the encouragement of the Idealist philosophy expounded in the previous century by T. H. Green and others. A world which was the partial expression of the Ideal which lay behind it was, to Christians, a world indwelt by God. There was the influence of Wordsworth and the Nature mystics inspired by

> a Spirit that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things.

There was the exciting and dominating conception of evolution and the new value assigned to human history. Nature was seen as a process of events, and within that process the activity of God was creative and sustaining.

At home in this "climate of opinion," a school of Christian Immanentism gathered increasing momentum. "The doctrine of Divine Immanence suddenly leapt into the forefront of theological discussion, and was proclaimed on all sides with the fervour of a new gospel. It seemed as if the time for this was just ripe. The twentieth century had inherited the self-confidence and optimism that had been generated by the theory of evolution and was stimulated by the growing material prosperity; and it was inclined to think either that the world could get along very well by itself without God, or that God could be recognized as the indwelling Guide directing the general course of events" (p. 209). The influence of the new Immanentism was seen in a doctrinal report issued by the Lambeth Conference of 1930. The report referred to a God who, while transcendent, is "continuously active within creation by His immanent activity." The Incarnation of Christ was said to mark the "attainment of the purpose of the whole cosmic process, through the agency of the immanent Logos." "A few decades earlier," remarks Mr Dewick, "such language would have sounded strange to the Lambeth Fathers themselves; and to Simeon or Pusey it would probably have savoured of rank heresy" (p. 212).

But even while the Lambeth Report was being written there were signs of that almost vehement reaction which has become such a feature of more recent theological opinion. As early as 1912 Baron von Hügel had emphasized objections now familiar: Immanentism obscured the full belief in the Divine Transcendence and the moral issues of life. Other writers felt that the distinctively Christian belief in the Incarnation of Christ was threatened. Dr Tennant and Dr Inge raised philosophical objections. And on the continent there was the Barthian thunder: God is not to be found in Nature, for Nature is entirely separated from God by the doctrines of creation *ex nihilo* and

of " discontinuity " between God and the world. He is not to be found in history, for " in history itself there is nothing, so far as the eye can reach, that can ground faith " (p. 238). " The Barthians certainly seem . . . to deny that any real knowledge of God as Indweller is possible, even for the most pious Christians, by the methods of scientific study and observation, or through the medium of religious and mystical experience. Such a denial challenges the conviction of countless devout souls, that by these channels God has spoken to them " (p. 244).

The battle is therefore joined, and Mr Dewick's book, giving us a statement of the issues and a full historical setting, is opportune. At the same time it is the more valuable because it is not written hastily for the occasion, but is the fruit of fifteen years' study. Interest in the subject was inspired by the challenge of Hindu thought. Wherever Hinduism moves in the direction of theism the conception of the Divine Immanence is emphasized. In modern India Mr Dewick found that the truth of God as Indweller was regarded by religiously minded Hindus as self-evident. But in the Christian Church of his acquaintance he found no similar emphasis. The situation suggested a possible fuller interpretation of the Christian faith, and led eventually to the present study which traces the history of the idea of God as Indweller, not only in Christian theology but in Eastern thought.

One of the most valuable sections of the book is his searching criticism of Barthianism. Mr Dewick respects the strength of the Barthian logic. But he evidently feels that reaction has gone too far. He suggests the wisdom of a middle path, avoiding the two extremes which would rule out either " God above " or " God within " (p. 259). For himself, it would seem, the path will go rather more to the left than to the right, with gateways wide open for all who recognize Jesus Christ as supreme above all others, " whether the background of thought be that of Absolutism and Transcendentalism, or that of Relativism and the Wider Immanentism " (p. 294).

R. H. L. Slater.

The World Mission of the Church. Report of the Madras Conference, 1938. International Missionary Council. 1s. 6d.

It is worth while to try to set out the points which have to be kept in mind when a report of a world conference of the Churches is studied by an ordinary member of the Church of England. At Madras the delegates spoke out of their experience from situations vastly different from the situation in England; therefore remember such things as the war in China, India in

transition, imperialism, the race problem, Palestine, Latin America predominantly Roman Catholic, etc. The so-called younger Churches were on an equal footing with the older Churches. The Europeans and Americans were just outnumbered. Representation was about 90 per cent. non-Anglican, and Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholics were not represented at all. India formed the background to the conference. There had been two other world conferences a year before, on "Life and Work" and on "Faith and Order." The desire for the unity of the Church is stronger in the mission field than it is at home, but, while organic union is the declared aim, in fact for the non-Catholic it is usually the federal principle which lies behind accepted statements. The conference was overworked, reports had to be drafted under pressure from time, and the brain quickly tires in such circumstances. In general, a conference is at best a necessary disease from which the Churches are suffering in this particular age; the report of the proceedings is less important than the experience of it by the delegates, and while the report contains communicable recommendations, many of which cannot be carried out, the experience is almost incommunicable, yet it stimulates to action.

A critical estimate of the report as a whole may be formed under three heads: the theology behind it, the strategy proposed by it, and the tactics recommended by it.

Theology.—The conference committed itself to a statement of "the Church's (*sic*) faith in its special meaning for our time." Unlike the classical creeds it includes a doctrine of man and sin, but it does not mention the sacraments, not even baptism. Whereas the Nicene Creed filled out the trinitarian implications of the Apostles' creed, the Tambaram creed reduces them. It seems, therefore, that "the world mission of the Church," which demands a Christian doctrine of society, demands far more co-operation from theologians, for there cannot surely be such a doctrine unless it issues from a trinitarian doctrine of God. And when shall we learn that a Christian social order is a sacramental order? There is a clear call here to Anglicans who pride themselves on their catholicity to stand in with, and not outside of, the interdenominational movement.

Strategy.—Probably the most significant of the sectional reports is that on the indigenous ministry of the Church. It is certainly better put together and better expressed than any other. The world mission depends largely on the training of Native ministries. Nothing is ultimately more important than this, as Rome saw clearly four hundred years ago. And the theological training is admitted in the report to be universally inadequate. "We therefore instruct the Committee of the International Missionary Council to take action in this matter, in consultation with the Churches, and that a commission be

appointed as soon as possible to arrange for the preparation of detailed studies of the situation where these have not already been made, to visit the main centres of theological education, and to work out a policy and programme for the training of the ministry in the younger churches." I venture to suggest that this is the most important paragraph in the report. Under the heading of strategy should come the report on an adequate program for Christian literature. This sets out the main lines of policy which will probably engage the attention of the Churches during the next ten years.

Tactics.—Emphasis on the family is apparent in other sections besides that on the Christian home. This is significant. It is becoming clear that unless the Church's ministry is directed towards the family as a whole, the fundamental unit of society, it will be found that a great deal of water has been poured into a bucket with holes in the bottom. Such of the old rules of tactics as have taken as the objective the individual apart from his membership in the family will need revision, and nothing short of a mental revolution is in prospect.

There is far more in this report of immensely stimulating matter, and missionary groups in parishes would be given a good idea of what foreign missions mean to-day if they would study it this winter.

J. A. Ramsbotham.

Montague Rhodes James. A Memoir by S. G. Lubbock, with a list of his writings by A. F. Scholfield. Cambridge University Press. 5s.

This memoir of Monty James will be very welcome to his innumerable friends, and especially to those who had not known much of the home background of this great and fascinating personality; for the picture drawn here of the rectory at Livermere in Suffolk explains a great deal. The foundations of his inexhaustible learning were laid here; here Barber and Johnson took their origin; and here, too, were nursed the love and the humour which kept his wit so fresh and so sweet to the taste. Mr Lubbock has rightly left the greater part of Dr James' story to be told in his own book *Eton and Kings*, in Mr Scholfield's admirable bibliography, and in the tablets of living memory; but this little volume provides a clue to them which makes them all mean more.

If greatness lies in the combination of the highest gifts of mind and character in perfect proportion, Monty James was one of the greatest men of our time. To be (without knowing it) the most learned man of your age; to be a master of every round-table game, and the most acceptable of all guests in every house; to preside over two great educational foundations, and to have it written of you that " it is safe to say that no Provost had ever been what

he was to the boys "—where else has such a combination of excellences and delights been found? He seems to belong equally to the present and to the future; to the present through his genius for friendship and his power of enriching life, and to the future through a series of scholarly works which are not likely for some centuries at least to be out of date. And his learning was always at others' service. Only a few days before his death, I had a note from him about the alternative version of an inscription which was to mark out the site of St Swithun's shrine in Winchester Cathedral. He indicated which he preferred, and added, "I seem to be living in a world of inscriptions." Whatever these may have been, none can be so imperishable as that of Dr James himself, written in the libraries of Christendom and in the hearts of men.

E. G. Selwyn.

Hawk among the Sparrows. By Desmond Hawkins. Longman. 7s. 6d.

This novel, concerned with the intimacies of a pretentious lower middle class household, is disappointingly unbalanced. Written with considerable technique, in a strong and sometimes artistic style, it lacks climax. The events it treats of are almost Hardy-esque, and the pictures of the two women's minds are well drawn. The most remarkable feature of Mr Hawkins' book is the careful artistry with which he sets out the mental processes of his heroine and villainess. At times he lapses unconsciously into metre, sometimes dactylic—on page 20, for instance, there are no less than four sentences ending with the cadence of a hexameter—sometimes it is into that very effective "flat" rhythm cultivated by Mr Auden. There is about this book the artist's touch, the painter's eye for significant detail. The character of Mrs Sparge is magnificently repulsive: we instinctively avoid breathing at all deeply when she is about, lest we should scent her nauseous fleshiness tinctured with cheap perfume. But to achieve this effect Mr Hawkins has recourse to an exotic and sometimes far-fetched series of images, as when he compares her to a dazed odalisque. Sexual awareness is represented as playing too large a direct part in the consciousnesses of these women; their characters are more straightforward and elemental than are such people in real life. Such an oversexed person as Mrs Sparge would have contracted complices, and her niece would not so quickly have arrived at truth when confronted with the mystery of her own body. We are led by the immense care with which the situation is created to expect something above the normal climax of intrigue and intrigue unravelled—but we had disappointedly to be content with just this. There are some good scenes, but on the whole *Hawk among the Sparrows* moves too slowly.

R. G. Lunt.

THE HUMAN CARAVAN. By the Comte du Plessis. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

This book is recommended by the publishers as being " something on the line of Mr Wells' *Outline*, but from a slightly different standpoint." It is an outline of history, written to show that the only thing which gives meaning or direction to the whole is the Roman Catholic Church. The line which leads from Abraham, through Christ and St Peter to the Pope and his Church, is the only one which exhibits absolute progress. And in that Church alone, which is the Kingdom of God on earth, can the fundamental laws which govern all human life finally attain their fulfilment—the Law of Unity, which makes men combine, and the Law of Dominion, which sets them under authority, whether military, political or spiritual. Here alone is constant possession, and progress towards the complete possession of the joy which all men seek. The existence of this Church is the proof of the divinity of Christ, and its necessary consequence.

As a synopsis of facts this book cannot compare in lucidity with that of Mr Wells. Unlike the latter, the Comte is not really interested in " information." Where one is not already reasonably well informed his summary references do not really tell one anything, and where one is, one longs to know his evidence. But, particularly where he deals with the earliest periods, there is a fundamental difficulty, if not indeed a contradiction. The author seeks to commend what the Bible and the Church say—*e.g.*, about the historicity of Adam and Eve—by showing that it is not incompatible with scientific research. But it is evident that the criteria of scientific method are not ultimate for him—how could they be?—and pages are consequently consumed in what we can only call a rhetorical wrangle with " advanced exegetes," " scientists " and " savants " unspecified. Similarly the historical evidence for the claims of the Pope is very brusquely dealt with, because the case is already decided on the basis of the Dominical sayings in Matthew xvi.

Such reality of progress as the West has exhibited (in contrast with the East, where dominions and groupings, relative progress and retrocession succeed each other without end, like the waves of the sea) has been due to the influence of Rome, partly thwarted by the recrudescence of individualism. Luther and Descartes prepare the way for Communism, Nazism and Mr Wells. Now East and West have penetrated one another, and the whole world is involved in the struggle which is to come. The City of God and the City of the World are becoming arrayed against each other in ever completer distinctness. The final victory of the City of God is certain, but it must be preceded by a final assault of the forces of the world—" an assault in the nature of a persecution, leaving the victory, as always, to those who suffer

persecution, and to their children." Then history will fulfil itself, and prepare for its own end, in the return of the Son of Man.

This is an impressive book, the fruit of forty years of study and thought by a mind both comprehensive and devout. It would be more readable if the historical facts were more coolly and systematically set out, with some indication, where necessary, of the historical evidence for them. Incidentally, the explicit recognition that to form an objective judgment on the evidence, whether scientific or historical, is *not* mere self-will, might make the references to " protestants," Anglicans included, more sympathetic.

T. R. Milford.

Newman's Apologia pro vita sua. Traduit de l'Anglais par L. Michelin Delimoges. Introduction et notes par Maurice Nédoncelle. Bloud et Gay, Paris.

Several important books about Newman have been published in France in recent years, and ought not to escape notice in England: M. Jean Guitton's *La philosophie de Newman : essai sur l'idée de développement* (1933); Mlle Fernande Tardivel's *La personnalité littéraire de Newman* and *J. H. Newman éducateur* (1937). The new translation of the *Apologia* (two earlier translations have long been out of print) is further evidence of contemporary interest, and is notable for us because of M. Nédoncelle's introduction, which is one of the most understanding accounts of Newman's career that we have ever read. We hope that he intends to expand it into a full-length treatise. M. Nédoncelle is more familiar with English theology and philosophy in the modern period than many English writers on these subjects. His book on von Hügel showed that; see also his *La philosophie religieuse en Grande-Bretagne de* 1850 *à nos jours*, which is significantly dedicated as " à la mémoire de John Henry Newman et de Friedrich von Hügel."

He has supplied this edition of the *Apologia* with a wealth of well-informed notes which will certainly be invaluable to French readers, and would not be superfluous for many English readers. We have noticed very few mistakes: on p. lii Acton is described as one of the Oxford converts; on p. 53 we read that " le parti libéral a disparu à peu près complètement après la grande guerre: Lloyd George est son dernier chef, sinon son unique représentant " (all the same, this is interesting evidence of the impression that the Liberal Party makes on a foreign observer); and on p. 98 M. Nédoncelle says that the word " Romanism " " d'ordinaire . . . s'applique en anglais aux choses de l'ancienne Rome." But these few exceptions only throw into relief the remarkable accuracy of the whole.

M. Nédoncelle maintains that, while Newman in becoming a Roman Catholic was consistently following the course of his own earlier thought and experience, this is not at all the same thing as to say that the Oxford Movement, if it had followed its own inner logic, would have proceeded Rome-wards. " C'est une question beaucoup moins claire qu'on ne le pense d'ordinaire en France."

A. R. V.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: C. Donleavy, *Sonnets on the Psalms* (5s.); R. d'Harcourt, *The German Catholics* (7s. 6d.)

CLARENDON PRESS: B. Williams (Oxford History of England), *The Whig Supremacy*, 1717-1760 (12s. 6d.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: T. Wigley, *The Necessity of Christian Modernism* (5s.).

DENT: M. C. D'Arcy, *Thomas Aquinas : Selected Writings* (Everyman) (2s.).

DUCKWORTH: H. J. Schonfield, *Jesus—a Biography* (8s. 6d.).

" HOLLANDIA," BAARN, NETHERLAND: J. Hartog, *The Sacrifice of the Church* (7s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: A. F. Winnington-Ingram, *The Secret of Happiness* (3s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: E. Brunner, *Man in Revolt* (15s.).

MOWBRAYS: C. S. Gillett, *Herman Leonard Pass : A Memoir* (n.p.); A. H. Otway, *The Unjust Steward in Disgrace* (6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: *Anglican Liturgies* (Alcuin Club) (8s. 6d.); A. E. Morgan, *The Needs of Youth* (10s.).

IMPR. PYRSOS, ATHENE: H. S. Alivasatos (Ed.), *Procès-Verbaux du premier Congrès de Théologie Orthodoxe.*

RELIGIOUS BOOK CLUB: B. I. Bell, *Religion for Living* (2s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: *Worship and Education* (2s.); J. R. Lumb, *Our Sunday Teaching* (1s.); H. P. Thompson, *Canadian Journey* (1s.); R. Smith, *Sketches from Penhalonga* (1s.); Amy Carmichael, *Kohila* (5s.).

SOUTHERN PUBLISHING CO., BRIGHTON: Marion Fitzgerald, *Rents in Moulsecoomb :* A report on rents and other costs of living in three Brighton housing estates, with a preface by the Bishop of Chichester (3d.).

CARL WINTER'S UNIVERSITÄTBUCHHANDLUNG, HEIDELBERG: M. Dibelius, *Paulus auf dem Areopag* (M. 2.80).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher